446

A

# CONSIDERATION

OF THE SUBJECT OF

# The Central Passenger Railway,

BEING A RAILWAY FOR PASSENGERS ONLY,

PROPOSED TO BE RUN FROM SECOND TO TWENTY-THIRD STREET,

VIA WALNUT AND CHESTNUT STREETS,

IN THE

CITY OF PHILADELPHIA.

---

"Eppur si muove!"—*Galileo.*

---

W. B. ZIEBER:
No. 106, SOUTH THIRD STREET, BELOW CHESTNUT:
PHILADELPHIA:
1858.

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2017 with funding from
This project is made possible by a grant from the Institute of Museum and Library Services as administered by the Pennsylvania Department of Education through the Office of Commonwealth Libraries

https://archive.org/details/considerationois00unse

# GENERAL CONSIDERATION

OF THE

# CHESTNUT & WALNUT STREET RAILWAY.

---

That conspicuous ascendency over all the cities of America, which, at one period, was the incontestable prerogative of Philadelphia, is gradually, but palpably, passing away. Her financial, commercial, and political supremacy, are already gone! Bolder and more active rivals are usurping that dominion which once was hers, but which can only be maintained, through the instrumentality of energy, activity, and indomitable enterprise. A palsy seems to have stricken her. Instead of devising new avenues to opulence and to empire, her whole genius is absorbed in a fanatical conservatism, and and in a studied and stupid warfare upon every measure which might tend to her development. Her policy, now, is but the reflex of what it was some forty years ago:—the era at which her relative retrogression visibly began. Four or five years of ferocious resistance were then opposed to the introduction of hydrant water. Upon this issue, the City Councils, of both Chambers, were ousted to a man! The very salvation of the city depended upon pumps! Nor until a large proportion of it had been burnt through the mere

insufficiency of water, did the howl of bigoted denunciation subside, and that obviously invaluable measure at length prevail. A similar scene transpired upon the introduction of gas! Five or six years were spent, in the most furious agitation, before our intolerable fogyism could be dissipated, and this vast accession to our comfort become invested with the "privileges of the city." Last—but not least in the same category—come *City Railways!* Since the year 1852, the propriety of their adoption has been unremittingly pressed either upon the attention of Councils or of the Legislature. Every objection to them founded upon fact, and every objection founded even upon fiction, has been patiently met but triumphantly and completely refuted. Nor does it even suffice that one railway, (a spectacle of conspicuous success,) should be already in full operation. Much remains yet to be said and done before the city railway system can be considered as completely inaugurated. It might have been thought that in this long interval, (nearly as long as the siege of Troy, and quite as long as the Revolutionary War,) a purpose much more stupendous might have been accomplished. But such is the City of Philadelphia! We are the head-quarters of old fogyism, and are dwindling rapidly into downright Rip Van Winkleism. Baltimore, Boston, Brooklyn, and New York have long ago tried and determined every question which relates to these roads; nor is there a solitary point involved, which is not within the reach of all who seek to be enlightened. Many persons, however, prefer not to be enlightened. It is troublesome: moreover, it is a Philadelphia fashion. They don't care to be advised. It is easier to take a blind and unreasoning exception to a measure than to undergo the exertion of ascertaining whether it possesses merit or not, and whether the happiness and prosperity of the community would be thereby enhanced, or whether even the objectors themselves would not be the gainers in the general gain. In short, the city railway question is destined (like the English Corn Laws) to divide our citizens into two very important classes:—those who have any capacity for the practical busi-

ness of life, and those who have not. A dog-in-the-manger policy, however, will not be found available here. Any one, who pleases, may object. And he may object, whether with or without a reason. It is a free country. But the force and weight of the objection will avail no further with the intelligence of Councils, than it is found to be sustained by sound principle and good sense.

Amongst the lists of those, remonstrating against the Central Railway, are discovered a multitude of ladies. What ominous dread has acted on their fears is not set forth. Indeed, neither on their part, nor on the part of the gentlemen under whose escort they appear, is any thing in the nature of *a reason* for remonstrance so much as insinuated. Whether the mute dissent of aristocratic charioteers is believed in itself to be sufficient to over-awe the Councils; and that those Bodies will swoon away at the mere idea of confronting the inhabitants of brown-stone houses: or whether, by common consent, Chestnut and Walnut streets are to be treated as enchanted ground, and plebeian cars not to be permitted to profane the sanctuary—does not appear. It is but fair however to assume, that there must be some ground for these objections, however unsubstantial or capricious. And since the parties themselves have not thought proper to disclose it—it may be assumed that it must consist in some or all the objections which are usually levelled at these great, new, modern, public conveniences. Mechanical principles however (under like circumstances) operate with like results, at all times, and in all places. There is no magic in a name. What is true in New York must be true in Philadelphia. What is true on Sixth street must be true on Chestnut. An enterprise, therefore, which has wrought such satisfactory results elsewhere, and which is commended to popular notice here, by so many and such urgent considerations, cannot fail (where circumstances are avowedly the same) to lead to consequences equally desirable. The ungracious welcome with which it has been greeted, however, in certain quarters, is the result of error or misconception: and originates not in objections to

the scheme itself, but to what is absurdly surmised and falsely imputed to it. Can any man, in his senses, credit that it is going to destroy or depreciate property? That after its introduction we can neither go out, nor drive out of doors, without a collision or contusion? That in short a car is anything else than an omnibus *moving on a straight line, and without noise?* Who, but a drummer, or the denizen of a nail-factory, could for an instant hesitate, between the silent comfort of the railway-car and the stunning rumpus of an omnibus? On Fifth and Sixth street every body is satisfied! Even those who were loudest and longest in their outcries against it, admit that they were in error, and that in every possible construction they are preferable to the omnibus.

So far as they can be collected, the objections, (which proceed from but a limited number of persons, and from a limited area of the city, and which also are restricted to grounds bearing but little logical relation to the subject,) when plainly stated, are more or less as follows:—

I. The scheme is an odious speculation and monopoly.

II. The streets are already too crowded and thus are totally unsuited to the introduction of railways.

III. Carriages will be banished from the streets: partly from the infamous condition of the pavements, and partly from the peril of presuming to stand before a door.

IV. The cars will disturb the repose of the streets through which they pass; and on Sundays, (with bells and whips and swearing drivers,) will occasion an interruption of religious worship.

V. Trains of large and cumbrous burthen cars, and long lines of mules, will be passing over the road, and keeping the streets in perpetual blockade.

VI. Real estate on the route will be heavily depreciated.

Now is all this, or any portion of it, actually true? Is this railway really going to prove a public nuisance? Or is it, on the contrary, as it professes to be, a vast public convenience, exempt from substantial objection, loudly called for by the general voice of the city, and a want which our growing population and expanding necessities plainly, potently, and imperiously demand?

A response to these interrogatories will neither be long nor difficult.

I. To the first objection—"that this is an odious speculation and monopoly"—it will be sufficient to reply, that any one who esteems it a speculation is invited to register his name as a stockholder, and thus appropriate the real or imaginary profit to himself. This will prove an effective antidote to the odium; and, inasmuch as, *by law*, the subscriptions to the stock must be public, the charge of *monopoly* is simply absurd and false. It is accessible to the purse of every citizen who seeks a participation in its receipts or a voice in its affairs.

II. "The streets are already too crowded," &c. The reason, here advanced as an objection, is the *very reason, above all others*, why the railway should be introduced! Persons urging this objection are the most eloquent advocates of the Road. Railways (beyond all other devices) economize time and space. Where time and space are most precious, (namely in the heart of crowded cities,) these railways are most indispensable. Cars move more quickly;—halt more quickly,—and carry more persons than an omnibus. In other words, in the same time and space, they do thrice the work, with but a tithe of the noise and the dust.

III. "Carriages will be banished, from the perils of crushing, and the badness of pavement."

If the cars were propelled by steam—if they were in trains

a square or more in length—if they were burthened by enormous weights—or if, from their extraordinary speed and momentum, they could not be arrested with instantaneous promptitude, there would perhaps be some sense and force in such objections. But the opposite of all this is the case! The cars carry no merchandize—are not moved by locomotives—are but little longer than an omnibus, and in like manner are drawn by horses. In fact the difference between the two vehicles is mainly this,—that the omnibus comprehends the whole street in its evolutions, and may crush a carriage anywhere: whilst the car is incapable of harm, save within its narrow limit of seven feet. Every one, beholding the track, is aware of this, and keeps from harm with readiness and ease. The omnibus however is without a brake. The only mode of stopping it, therefore, is to pull upon the mouths of the horses, the danger and the difficulty, attending which, are witnessed daily. The cars on the other hand (through the agency of the brake) are arrested with a promptitude so great, that all the danger may be said to lie on the side of the omnibus. The most refractory horses can be at once arrested by the brake: and moreover the habit of racing, which is so common and so dangerous in the case of omnibuses, is wholly impossible upon the railway.

The statistics of accidents on the New York roads demonstrate that apprehensions of danger from this cause have been greatly overstated and exaggerated; the overstatement in fact amounting to a hoax. There is from seventy to eighty per cent. less danger than in the use of omnibuses.

The pavements, moreover, will be better than they were before. Not only will the wear and tear of the omnibuses be removed, (which is estimated at sixty dollars, per coach, per annum,) but the substructure of wood and iron, firmly braced together with massive spikes, will preserve the arch of the pavement in a better and firmer condition than it could possibly be without that support.

By reference to the hack stand, (on Fifth street by the State House yard,) it will be seen that carriages, standing at the

453



curbstone, are at a distance of over *four feet* from the passing cars; nor has the slightest indication either of danger or inconvenience manifested itself, either to the one party or the other.

The mercantile traffic on this street also goes on as before: drays load and unload without injury, or without impediment, and this third objection therefore, when closely scrutinized, is found to resolve itself into thin air.

IV. "The cars will disturb the repose of the streets, especially on Sundays."

This objection partakes of the nature of pure nonsense.

Instead of the eternal clamor of the omnibus, which, to the sound, as well as to the sick, is one of the greatest evils of city life, the cars move with a march so silent, that the use of bells is necessary to advertise the public of their approach. The footsteps of the horses, and the light sound of the bells, are the only disturbance realized. In fact, the strongest recommendation (with many persons) in favor of the cars, is the relief they afford to the public ear, from the unceasing clang of those stunning and ponderous omnibuses—the heavy artillery of our highways.

Inasmuch as the cars are prohibited, by law, from running on Sundays, there is nothing to consider in this part of the objection.

V. "Trains of burthen cars with long lines of mules will blockade the streets."

The rail alone it is alleged will make the street impassable for carriages; whilst, in superaddition to this, swarms of mules, with long trains of burthen cars, will blockade the street, and convert the railway into an intolerable nuisance.

All this is utterly untrue. The rail, so far from an obstruction, gives to the passing coach all the facility and ease of a plank road, and numberless persons, who have discovered this fact, are in the habit of seeking Fifth and Sixth streets from choice, in order to escape from the jolting of the ordinary pavement.

When it is stated, that the double business of transit of freight and passengers, *cannot possibly co-exist* in cities (owing to the utter impossibility of the cars keeping the requisite time) the residue of this objection falls to the ground.

VI. "The value of real estate will be greatly depreciated," &c.

This objection is not only groundless, but is the mere coinage of the imagination. By the common experience of mankind, real estate is found to be most valuable, where the throng of men and business is greatest and most constant.

A store established in a desert would elicit no attention, and transact no business: for the very obvious reason that it is unknown and inaccessible. Upon the great highways of a city, on the contrary, it is not only seen and noted by every passenger, but, from convenience of access alone, is the recipient of an enormous patronage. Every thing, therefore, which multiplies the throng on these highways enlarges the sphere of that patronage. In equal ratio with this increment, is the increasing value communicated to real estate.

Such, then, are the objections to the Central Passenger Railway! Those who have urged them have done so doubtlessly in good faith:—but (as it appears) the foundation, on which they pretend to stand, has no existence! There is to be no desecration of the Sabbath:—there are to be no burthen cars:—there are to be no carriages crushed, whilst standing at our doors:—the streets are not to be rendered noisy and impassable:—nor by the universal ruin of real estate is Philadelphia to be likened either to Herculaneum or to Pompeii. So far from all this, the plain and inevitable result of the railway will be, to do for Philadelphia, in like degree, what hydrant-water and gas have done:—to render the city more comfortable, more habitable, more prosperous, and more progressive than heretofore, and to involve, in a participation in these benefits, every interest, great or small, within the wide circumference of the city. That outcry, which is raised against it, (like the wail of Egypt over her first born,) is the

mere echo of the same outcry, which opposed the gas and Schuylkill water. It will have the same effect now as then, but no more. It will alarm the timid, but confirm the bold, and, there is not an individual, of real courage and liberality, but will take a pride in doing battle in the cause of solid and rational progress against the imbecile fanaticism which is arrayed against it.

In fact, it was in the honest and certain trust of being able to secure, to these our most crowded thoroughfares, the most convenient, the most tasteful, and the most truly agreeable mode of conveyance, which human ingenuity has thus far devised, that the many friends of this measure, living on those streets, have lent it, and still lend it, their active, earnest and unceasing coöperation.

436

# PARTICULAR CONSIDERATION

OF THE

# CHESTNUT & WALNUT STREET RAILWAY.

## CONCISE REASONS IN FAVOR.

I.

Because it will be *systematizing* travel, and will therefore be just as preferable to omnibuses, cabs, &c., as *any thing* done by *system* is better than doing it in a *disorderly* manner.

All the flood of travel coming from, or tending to, the northern and southern parts of the city by the lateral streets, will be poured down Walnut street and up Chestnut.

The stream of travel will be regular and uninterrupted.

Other vehicles will fall into the same stream and flow with it.

The Councils can by ordinance give the *right of the track* to any vehicle following the current of travel.

Out of the chaos of Chestnut street will come order.

II.

A much *greater number* of persons can be carried than at present is done, and, therefore, a large class of people accommodated, who, now, from the crowds in the omnibuses, their interruptions and inconveniences, are deprived of the means of transportation.

III.

Much *space* will be economized, a matter of the first importance in a street so narrow as Chestnut.

One car, while occupying no more room than an omnibus, will carry two or three times as many passengers.

IV.

The traveller's *personal comfort* will be greatly increased.

He will have much more room in the car, than in the omnibus.

He will be transported smoothly and quietly, instead of roughly and noisily.

He can pay his fare without the intervention of others, and without being obliged to stagger over the limbs of his neighbors. The fare being five cents instead of six, he will be spared considerable annoyance in the making of change.

He can get in and out of the car with much greater ease and comfort than he can enter and leave the omnibus—a point of great importance to the old and feeble.

He will be better protected from the rain, the cold, and the sun.

He will be enabled to employ his time, while in the car, in conversation, or in reading, or even in writing with a pencil.

The car can be warmed by a fire in winter, and can be better ventilated, and kept cleaner and freer from mud in bad weather than the omnibus—the latter, a circumstance of much consequence, (all women will admit,)—and they ride as much as men.

V.

*Time* will be economized.

The same distance can be travelled in *half* the time consumed by the omnibus.

To people, living two or three miles from their places of business, this is a matter of paramount consideration.

VI.

It will be *safer*.

The accidents to women, children, and elderly persons in getting in and out of omnibuses are so frequent as to deter great numbers of those classes from riding at all.

The car can be entered and left without a particle of danger.

VII.

It will be a more *humane* system.

The sufferings of omnibus horses, now become almost a proverb, are a disgrace and reproach to humanity.

The horses drawing the cars will never have any labor to perform beyond their capacity.

They will not be subjected to the violent concussions of the pole, nor the irregular draught (in fact a succession of shocks, upon their shoulders)—keeping their flesh constantly raw, and their limbs crippled.

Their only labor will be a moment's steady draught at starting, and afterwards the mere exercise of locomotion; for, the car once started, a minimum of force will suffice to keep it moving.

VIII.

It will cost the passenger *less money.*

The uniform fare will be five cents instead of six, and, over any two roads, by a system of commutation, probably not more than three cents for each road.

The charter provides that the fare shall not exceed five cents, and all other city railways are authorized to connect with this, thus affording to passengers an uninterrupted transit, in the same cars, over two or more roads.

IX.

The danger of *collision* will be *less* than with omnibuses, thus offering a degree of positive *protection* to carriages and all light vehicles.

For the car must always be confined to a fixed, certain, reliable, and visibly perceptible portion of the street, and the drivers of other vehicles can, therefore, anticipate its course with the greatest minuteness and certainty.

Where and when the unwieldy omnibus will strike, is a matter known *after* its occurrence.

The car can be stopped instantaneously by means of brakes, no matter how unmanageable the horses may be.

The omnibus is completely subject to its own impetus and the caprice of the horses.

X.

The public will be afforded accommodations for transportation, upon this route, in any weather, and through *all hours of the night.*

XI.

All *other vehicles* will have a smooth tram-way to travel on, and thus, besides being better protected from collision, will economize *wear and tear*, and vastly promote the comfort of the rider.

XII.

The *space for other vehicles* will be absolutely *increased*, because *half as many cars* will do *more* business than the omnibuses, and a car occupies no more ground than an omnibus.

XIII.

The pavements of Chestnut and Walnut streets will be always in *fine order:* their frequent bad condition is solely attributable to the omnibuses.

When these are removed, no vehicles will be left sufficiently heavy to plough up the pavements, as they now are.

The substructure of wood and iron will aid essentially in supporting the arch of the pavement, and so preserve the regular, uniform gradients of the surface of the street.

The *whole route* must be paved with *flag-stone crossings*, every two hundred and fifty feet.

XIV.

The *comfort* of *private residents* upon the streets will be greatly *increased.*

Besides all the advantages, as a means of transportation, which, in eommon with others, they and their families will enjoy, the streets before their doors will be smoother and eleaner, and they themselves less diseomforted by noise and dust.

XV.

The relief to the *invalid,* of whom there are constantly hundreds upon the route, will be inealeulable.

Every minute of the day he is now distraeted by the rattling of the passing omnibus, shaking, like the discharge of ordnanee, the house to its very foundation.

XVI.

The *pedestrian's* eomfort will be mueh promoted.

Besides eseaping the elouds of dust, eaused by the omnibuses, he will be spared the eonstantly reeurring annoyanee of interruption to eonversation, sometimes totally suspending it, for an ineonvenient period of time.

He will no longer be subjected to that intolerable nuisanee of having his elean garments bespattered with mud and water by the wheels of the omnibus, as they slide unexpeetedly into the gutters.

XVII.

The business of all the *storekeepers* will be vastly *extended,* as thousands of persons, with the convenienees then offered them, will go shopping who now stay at home.

If Chestnut street does not seeure this road, she will, in five years, lose such ground in the way of business, in favor of Areh, Fifth and Sixth, or Tenth and Eleventh streets, as she would pay millions of dollars to regain.

XVIII.

The *tax-payer* will be greatly *relieved.*

*Every car* must, by the charter, pay annually into the City Treasury a *license of Fifty Dollars.*

The railroad will be subject to a *heavy taxation*, both for State and City purposes.

The entire *cost of paving* the most expensive four miles of street in the city will be saved to Philadelphia for ever. For the importance of this gain to her, vide Appendix, Item VII.

City Councils have *appropriated* large sums of money to build railroads at great distances from here, and which were only constructively advantageous to the city's interests at some very distant day.

Shall the Councils now *prohibit* an enterprize, which promises an *immediate, certain* and *direct revenue* of great value to the city, and without the *outlay* of a *single farthing?*

The gain to the city in car-licenses, taxes, paving, and improved condition of the streets, will not be less than six thousand dollars per annum, *perpetually.* This alone, without taking into the account the great personal benefits to the community, will be equivalent to a payment into the City Treasury, of *one hundred thousand dollars in cash.*

## XIX.

The *general plan* of city railways will be *incomplete without this line.*

The Fifteenth and Sixteenth, the Tenth and Eleventh, and the Fifth and Sixth street lines, all require this road for the accommodation of their passengers.

Otherwise they must be transhipped into omnibuses on reaching Chestnut street, and so pay double fares, besides being subjected to great inconvenience.

## XX.

Large areas of *real estate,* between the Schuylkill and Nineteenth street and Spruce and Market streets, will be immediately made *available for building purposes*, and that portion of the city thereby *improved and beautified.*

## XXI.

A great deal of *damage* to the continuous lines of high *structures* upon the route will be avoided.

From the vibrations of foundations, frames and walls, kept up unceasingly throughout the year by the concussion of the omnibuses upon the stone pavements, a constant damage is going on to houses, to the sealed joints of gas and other pipes, and particularly to painted walls and ornamented ceilings, and even to costly furniture, far greater than is generally imagined. See Appendix, Item VIII.

## XXII.

The construction of this road will be the means of ultimately *forcing bridges over the Schuylkill both at Chestnut and Walnut streets*, and so bring into great demand one of the most desirable districts within the bounds of the consolidated city, viz: that bordering upon Chestnut and Walnut streets in West Philadelphia.

When these extensions become thus connected, Chestnut and Walnut streets will be the most beautiful thoroughfares of any city in the world, affording facilities for locomotion greater than have ever yet been provided in first-class streets.

## XXIII.

The *public sentiment* is in favor of the road.

This has been manifested by numerous petitions to the Legislature and the Councils, by daily communications in the newspapers, by public speeches and private conversation, and in every way that it can be possibly displayed.

Space has been reserved in the Appendix for a few articles selected from a vast number of Communications to the Public Press. See Appendix, Item IV.

## XXIV.

The *public press* of Philadelphia, with scarcely an exception, has spoken *editorially* in favor of this road—an infallible barometer of *public sentiment*, precluding the necessity of all arguments or demonstration.

For extracts from these articles, see Appendix, Item III.

## XXV.

A large *majority of property owners and residents* upon Chestnut and Walnut streets are in favor of the road.

*All who do not actually object to the railway may be presumed to be in its favor*, for the Public has recognized the advantage of the system, and it is not to be called on every day in the year to give its positive affirmative sanction to an improvement, already distinctly acknowledged and accepted.

In the course of the signing of petitions, hundreds of the best residents upon Chestnut and Walnut streets declined signing whilst distinctly expressing their approval of the railroad. "Because of the trouble of signing;" "because they did not wish to see their names in print;" "because they never signed petitions;" "because they did not wish to disoblige a neighbor, who entertained a great prejudice against it;" &c., &c.

A very small *minority* has remonstrated against the road.

See statement in the Appendix, Item V.

## XXVI.

The Legislature, (the sovereign power of the State,) has *authorized the construction* of this road.

To the Councils, simply remains the power of regulating *the mode of its construction*, by such ordinances as may be thought necessary.

By *prohibiting* it, in toto, Councils would be exceeding their duty, and thwarting the already expressed desire of the city, through her representatives at Harrisburg.

# OBJECTIONS—ANSWERED CONCISELY.

I.

The railroad will *depreciate real estate* upon Chestnut and Walnut streets.

So far from this effect ensuing, every foot *upon the whole route* will be rendered more valuable.

Why is Chestnut street property *more valuable* than on any *other* street? Simply because it is the greatest place of *resort*

How, then, will the means of *increasing* the concourse, be an instrument of deterioration to the real estate?

It may be laid down as an axiom that *the greater the crowd* upon any street, *the more valuable is the property* upon it. The reason being that it becomes the most convenient for the transaction of business,—because it multiplies that business, and because the aspects of life there are more exciting and interesting.

Whilst this will hold good upon the *whole route*, the property in the neighborhood of the western terminus will be particularly enhanced in value. Complete squares of ground, that are now practically as inaccessible as if beyond the Schuylkill, will at once form sites for private residences, almost as convenient for the tenant, as if in the heart of the city.

If it does not suffice that sound logical arguments should lead to these conclusions, the incredulous *propriétaire* must be told that this *has already been* the effect of passenger railways, not once, nor in a single locality, but always, and in every section of a railway route. Upon the whole line of Fifth and Sixth streets a *single authenticated instance,* of the depreciation of property, cannot be produced.

In New York the same results have been experienced. The railways there run through crowded business streets, through narrow unfrequented ones, and through spacious aristocratic avenues. A *material and general rise of pro-*

*perty* has invariably followed their introduction. See Appendix, Item IX.

Those, therefore, who oppose this railway are not only acting against the interests of the *whole community,* but against their own *individual interests.* There is not an advantage in it, as set forth, in which every remonstrant will not share. All the arguments in its favor apply with the same force to him.

If actual and visible results fail to convince the opponent, he must be left to the effects of Time, the universal healer, for his cure. It did not suffice that George Stephenson should actually put a locomotive engine in daily successful operation, that others should believe it. It was constantly asserted for years that, that could not be done, which was, all the while, being performed. For a period of *eight years* did his travelling engine do its regular and profitable work, before a second locomotive railroad was constructed!

II.

Chestnut street is already *too much crowded* to admit of a passenger railway.

---

On this very account is it recommended.

Its object is to economize space. It is the *more* needed in Chestnut street, *because* it is narrow. Were it as wide as Broad street, there would be ample space for the omnibuses, and would not be so necessary to *condense* the crowd, as it now is.

Whatever *room,* there may be at *present,* will be largely *increased,* for the number of vehicles will absolutely be greatly diminished, and moreover, those, that will remain, will be *distributed* between Chestnut and Walnut streets, instead of being all confined to the former; besides which, each car will perform the trip in half the time the omnibus does.

Were the number of persons to be transported by the cars *to remain exactly the same* as are now carried in the stages, and taking the bulk of the two vehicles to be the same, there would be economized in Chestnut street *eighty-seven and a half per cent.* of the space now occupied by the omnibuses!

This is mathematically demonstrable. Thus:

As one car will carry at least *twice* as many passengers as the omnibus, only half of the vehicles now in use would be required. Here would be realized a reduction, of the space obstructed, of — 50 per cent.

The cars would perform their trips in *half* the time the omnibuses would. This would reduce half the remaining space, fifty per cent., which would be twenty-five per cent. of the whole. — 25 per cent.

The room then left obstructed would be twenty-five per cent. of the original compass. As the cars would be equally divided between Chestnut and Walnut streets, one half of this space will be saved in Chestnut street, which would constitute twelve and a half per cent. of the original volume. — $12\frac{1}{2}$ per cent.

$87\frac{1}{2}$ per cent.

Thus it will be seen, and it cannot be gainsayed, that, with the cars, *twice as much* business could be done in Chestnut street as now, and at the same time there would be economized *seventy-five per cent.* of the space at present occupied by the omnibuses!

Is it, or is it not, prejudicial to the city's interests, to remove *three fourths* of all the omnibuses now in Chestnut street, and yet vastly improve the means of transportation?

## III.

It will be found impossible *to load and unload* vehicles and for carriages to stand *before stores* and dwellings.

---

With a desire of applying the *severest test* to this question, the extensive brewing firms, paper and rag merchants, and others engaged largely in business, in Fifth and Sixth streets,

were specially consulted. Scores of drays, *of the largest size*, are constantly being employed by these establishments, taking on, or discharging, casks, bundles of paper, immense bales of rags, &c. Their opinion upon this head should be decisive: for Fifth and Sixth streets, between Market and Chestnut, are themselves crowded streets, and, indeed, upon the whole line of the Central Railway, it would be difficult, and perhaps impossible, to find a locality where so satisfactory a trial of this subject could be made.

For the experience of these parties, see Appendix, Item VI.

Proving also that the rule holds as good, in those occurrences of similar nature before other classes of buildings, *private houses*, &c., many well-known citizens give their evidence to the same effect.

Better experience could not be had in Chestnut street. Carriages are constantly standing before some of the doors in Fifth and Sixth streets, above and below Walnut. In the first named of these two streets, particularly, is the matter well tested. *A line of carriages stands almost constantly* the *continuous* length of Independence Square; whilst, on the opposite side of the street, before some of the numerous public buildings, private offices, or shops, other vehicles are standing every hour of the day.

Gentlemen, whose observation is, from their localities, frequently directed to these matters, attest that no interruption whatever occurs. See the same document last referred to.

Granting that it is inconvenient or even impossible to load or unload a wagon from its *rear*, it does not follow that this is the most important object of life—particularly, when, as it appears by the experience of the persons quoted, there must be *some* means of getting *over* the difficulty. Perhaps it is done by turning the wagon somewhat *obliquely*, or even by doing the work *laterally*. Whatever the plan *may* be, one *must* exist, for the witnesses declare, one and all, that "the railroad does not *in any way interrupt* the *business* of the street."

IV.

The rail will form an obstacle to the free *passage of carriages across* it.

---

This is contradicted by the same evidence referred to under the preceding head.

No gentleman in town has had more practical experience with horses and wagons, and in driving, than certain of the parties here giving their testimony.

Whilst the city tolerates now, and has done so for years, sharp, high rails, through Market, Third, and Dock streets, parts of which are *crowded as much as Chestnut street itself,* and these rails covered *incessantly* with long freight and emigrant trains, yet there are those who gravely argue that a light *flat* rail, for *small, rapidly moving* cars, will be, in Chestnut street, an *impossibility!*

The obstruction presented by the rail of a passenger road to carriage wheels, in crossing, is scarcely greater than that offered by every cobble stone encountered. And moreover, *competent judges* have declared that the depression of the Fifth and Sixth street rail, seven-eighths of an inch, is *unnecessarily great,* and that it may be *reduced,* with perfect safety to the moving car, to *five eighths* of an inch. This will differ, almost imperceptibly, from a broad, *flat, or slightly scooped,* iron tram way, perfectly flush with the pavement, which eventually, it is confidently believed, will be laid, with a double track, in every principal street, of all the large cities both in Europe and America.

V.

The streets will be *obstructed by the snow* thrown from the track upon each side.

---

There might be some force in this objection, if the snow were indeed to be disposed of in this way, but, in reality, it will be the duty of the railway company to *carry it away,* and for any neglect to do so heavy fines may be imposed.

See the general ordinance to regulate passenger railways, Appendix, Item II, (Section 3.)

It has been found, however, by experience, in New York, that the track may be kept clear of this obstruction, by sprinkling salt upon it, whilst the snow is falling, and the evidence of one gentleman shows that *those streets laid with track are more passable* in winter time for all kinds of travel, than those streets that are without the rail.

See Appendix, Item IX, (Fourth Letter.)

VI.

The *cars themselves* will *obstruct* the street.

---

This would be true if they were burthen cars, or long and slowly moving passenger cars.

But the charter prohibits freight from being carried, see Appendix, Item I, (Section 1,) and the passenger cars, authorized, will not be permitted to *stand*, and obstruct the streets. See ordinance, Appendix, Item II, (Section 6.)

In case of a disregard of this restriction, Councils have reserved to themselves a summary method of enforcing attention to it.

It will be impossible then, that a car will be an obstruction, when it occupies little more space than an omnibus, and moves twice as fast, whilst also, the actual number of them, upon any one street, will be considerably less than that of the present omnibuses.

VII.

The streets will be filled *both with omnibuses and cars.*

---

This objection will be dissipated, when it is stated that it is provided in the charter of this and other passenger railroad companies, that, among them, they shall, before running their cars, *buy off* nearly *all the omnibus lines in town.*

This result, however, would have been brought about just as effectually, through the powerful competition offered by the cars.

VIII.

With railroads in Market, Spruce and Pine Streets, this will be *unnecessary.*

---

At least one-half of the whole population of Philadelphia pass frequently through Chestnut Street. They desire to move where it is *pleasant to do so*, and if a hundred *parallel* railroads were built, (but none in that street,) the people would still be unaccommodated. The travel is undeniably in that great thoroughfare; and, therefore, whilst discussing the necessity of a railroad in this or that direction, whatever conclusions may be arrived at, no extent of reasoning will argue away the distinctive character of Chestnut Street, or the imperative need of improving the means of locomotion *there.* It is not to the point to say that accommodations have been provided *elsewhere.* The parallel railroads cannot transport from Chestnut Street its thousand attractive shops —not at least for a long time to come, and at great expense: and such result is surely not desirable. The finest improvements have been made in that street, and, that it should retain its supremacy, it is only necessary to provide it with the improved means of transit that have not been denied to inferior streets.

The above objection might be urged with just as much force, and no more, as that a railroad from Cape May to Sandy Hook would suffice for the travel between Philadelphia and New York.

IX.

It is argued that city railroads are most needed in *crowded thoroughfares,* yet who ever dreamed of such a thing as suggesting a railway upon the *Strand* of London? And why has one not been constructed upon Broadway, New York?

---

These were the very words which fell, as if clinchers, from the lips of the learned counsel who appeared for the remonstrants before the Railroad Committee.

Fortunately the answer to each query is readily at hand. See Appendix, Item X.

## X.

It is nothing but a *speculation.*

---

What does this charge mean?

Why, that a great deal of money is to be made out of it. How is it to be made? By transporting immense numbers of people—many more than are now carried.

This is a direct confession of the urgent *necessity* of the road. The people will not pay their immense sums of money without getting their *quid pro quo.* Thousands will be benefitted who now suffer for want of accomodation.

## XI.

It will be an *arbitrary monopoly.*

---

So far from this being the case, it will be completely subject to the control of the city; and the restrictions *already* imposed upon it, even before it comes into existence, are of the most *stringent* character.

By its charter it is confined to a *single track*, and to carrying *passengers.* It must pay *fifty dollars per annum for every car* and keep up the *entire paving* of the streets. It cannot charge more than *five cents* fare. It must *buy off the omnibus lines* from Chestnut and Walnut streets. It must *connect* with *other passenger railways*, and permit them to *run their cars over it.* It is made *subject* to all the provisions of the *General Railroad Act*, and of the *City Ordinance regulating Passenger Railways.* The latter law *subjects the road*, the *manner of laying it*, and *all the details* to the City Board of Surveys. It exacts *flag stone crossings* every two hundred and fifty feet, and imposes a *fine* of *fifty dollars* for every ne-

glect to conform thereto. The Railway Company must *clear away the snow*, under a *penalty* of *twenty dollars* for *every square* left obstructed. If it *neglects the paving* the *cars are to be stopped running*. It is liable to all the *fines*, *forfeitures*, and *damages incurred* by its *employees*. Its *rate of running* is regulated within *safe bounds*. Its cars are *prohibited* from *stopping* on the *crossings*, under a *penalty* of *five dollars* for every offence. And in fine, after imposing *many other* minor restrictions, the city has reserved to itself *the right of buying the road at any time at the cost price*, which the Company must furnish, *in detail under oath*, to the City Solicitor: so that if the fearful effects, foreboded by some, should actually be realized, a ready door for escape would always remain open.

No one, upon reading this array of pains and penalties can rationally allege, that the city's representatives, in the Legislature and in the Councils, have been regardless of her interests!

Restrained by such limitations, and with rival routes upon every other parallel street, the charge of *arbitrary monopoly* cannot well be sustained.

## XII.

A *large and influential class* of the community is *opposed* to it.

---

This, after all, is the objection which operates with the greatest force against the proposed improvement.

And in point of truth and fact it is no objection at all!

Just so far as those opposing it offer *reasons against* it, so far are they entitled to consideration; but when they, (five hundred and seventy-one *individuals*,) in a pamphlet of twenty-six pages, merely signify their *disapproval* of it, without condescending to urge a *solitary reason* for their course, it is an act savouring almost of insolence. Is the opinion of five hundred and seventy-one persons, unsupported by a shadow of argument, to weigh against the popular voice, numbering four or five hundred thousand souls?

Our whole population at times have occasion to travel through Chestnut street; it is their favorite thoroughfare, and they have the right to the most agreeable method, within their means, of transporting themselves through this great avenue. Are the wishes of any prescribed class, which certainly does not count a *thousand* persons, (and they principally retired citizens, who have no occasion to use cheap conveyances,) of any consideration whatever, when arrayed in hostility to the interests of several hundred thousand men, women and children, composed of all classes?

It would be desirable, if practicable, to gratify even the *prejudices* of those who expostulate against the road, but it is a fact, that no other streets, but the two in question, would subserve the interests of the great central masses of the city. It is impossible therefore to indulge the wishes of the few who remonstrate.

Besides, it is *too late* to remonstrate against the railway in absolute terms. The Legislature has authorized it, and the Councils' duty is clear to see the road built in the best manner, and under their regulations.

It is reiterated, that it is no argument, per se, that the adversaries are numerous and respectable.

History teaches us that the same classes, and in equal or greater numbers, have invariably opposed, with like virulence, every improvement that the progressive and philanthropic have advanced for the amelioration of our race. The illustrations upon this head, which might be drawn from the lessons of the past, are innumerable. A few, occurring most readily to the mind, are added in the Appendix, Item XI, and note on page fifty.

Let a few years pass by and it will be as much *a source of shame* for any man to be obliged to confess that he opposed a passenger railway in Chestnut street, as it must be galling now for those to remember their course, who resisted the introduction into our city of water, gas, and the public schools.

## XIII.

Those who remonstrate *live upon the streets*, and their consent is *necessary*.

---

This objection betrays a great ignorance of one of the simplest doctrines of law—which is that the State has always reserved to itself the right of *eminent domain* over *its whole territory*, and if the Legislature thought fit, it could run a railway, not only through Chestnut and Walnut streets, but *through the very houses* standing upon those streets.

This doctrine is in force in every civilized country on the globe, but it so happens that in Pennsylvania, as regards the great streets and highways, the owners adjoining have *no title whatever in them, and never had,* as they were laid out and reserved for the government, *before* the land was sold. If therefore Chestnut and Walnut streets were *utterly abandoned by the public*, the property holders on the line thereof would have no more right to take possession of the streets than any other human beings. See an able article upon this subject. Appendix, Item IV, (Second Communication.)

Those, therefore, who reside in *any other sections* of the city, and who desire this railroad for their convenience, have just the same right to be transported through these highways, *in the way which suits them best*, as the persons living *upon the streets*. *Every citizen* of Philadelphia is entitled to the *same consideration* upon this question—and yet five or six hundred persons presume to set their faces against the wishes of nearly half a million!

## XIV.

A *majority of the property owners* upon the streets is *opposed* to it.

---

The *value* of this objection has been sufficiently considered under the preceding head. Let the *truth* of it now be inquired into. The assertion is made in a pamphlet of 26

pages, entitled a "Remonstrance against the Central Passenger Railway."

The alleged majority of property owners opposed, is made out by a curious statement, as follows:

Instead of setting out with the figures showing the *whole number of feet of real estate fronting upon the route*, it first leaves out of the calculation entirely both sides of Second street, and both sides of 23rd streets, 2,040 feet! Secondly it rejects all the public property, (although the public has spoken in favor of the railroad) 3,314 feet! Thirdly, it deducts the property of banks, saving funds, *neutrals*, &c., as if of no account, 8,638 feet! Fourthly, it deducts without explanation, 795 feet! Having thus, without the least justice, thrown 14,787 feet out of the scale, it is boldly stated that *one half* of the whole is 10,702 feet,—and that 13,672 feet are opposed.

The truth is that the whole front of property on the route is 36,192 feet, the half of which is over 18,000 feet. (See certificate of the City Surveyor. Appendix, Item V.) By the showing therefore of the remonstrants themselves the number of feet of real estate front opposed is not one half! But what *evidence* have we that 13,672 feet are really opposed? Nothing beyond a broad assertion.

Grant, however, that it is true. This whole property, at a fair estimate, is mortgaged for about one half its value. The amount of *actual interest* upon the route of this railroad, alleged to be adverse to it, does not, therefore, exceed *one-fifth*. Opposed to this interest, are four-fifths, who either speak *directly in favor, by petitions*, or by *abstaining from remonstrating*.

That the adverse influence *really* amounts to a *fifth* is a mere allegation. As far as there is any *evidence* there may not be a *twentieth*

# APPENDIX.

## I.

## AN ACT
## TO INCORPORATE
## THE CENTRAL PASSENGER RAILWAY COMPANY.

SECTION 1. *Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania in General Assembly met, and it is hereby enacted by the authority of the same*, That Francis M. Drexel, Thomas Hart, Ward B. Hazeltine, William B. Hart, Samuel Bradford, Alexander Biddle, William Craig, Alfred Stille, Samuel J. Reeves, Joseph W. Ryerss, Benjamin H. Brewster, Frederick Brown, L. J. Levy, Townsend Sharpless, G. G. Presbury, Samuel Simes, James S. Earle, N. G. Howard, Charles Oakford, A. F. Glass, William Parvin, Jr., James D. Brown, Joseph W. Harrison, Ellis Lewis, David Lapsley, William D. Lewis, John Anspach, Jr., Charles Leland, Franklin A. Comly, Joseph H. Trotter, William L. Maddock, Robert W. Cushman, E. S. Jones, Pliny Fisk, and William Duane, be commissioners to open books and receive subscriptions pursuant to the provisions of the first section of the Act of February nineteenth, one thousand eight hundred and forty-nine, entitled "An act regulating railroad companies," to organize a company by the name of the Central Passenger Railway Company, with authority to build a city passenger iron tram railway, with single track, through Walnut and Chestnut streets, in the city of Philadelphia, and to unite the same on Second and Twenty-third streets. *Provided*, That the said Company shall never obstruct the free use of said streets, by permitting freight or burthen cars, or any other than their passenger cars to pass over the same or any portion thereof. *And provided further*, That the said Company shall be subject to the provisions of the tenth section of the act of April twenty-first, one thousand eight hundred and fifty-five, requiring the submission of their plans and surveys to the Board of City Surveyors. *And provided further*, That the said Company shall annually pay into the

Treasury of the City of Philadelphia the sum of fifty dollars for every car regularly run upon said railway, and shall also keep the streets through which the said railway passes, so far as the said railway shall run along said streets, in perpetual good repair at the proper expense of said company. *Provided*, That before this act shall take effect, the constituted authorities of the City of Philadelphia shall declare by ordinance their consent to the construction of said railroad on the streets indicated.

SECT. 2. That pursuant to the fourth section of said act of February nineteenth, one thousand eight hundred and forty-nine, the stockholders shall choose a president and six directors, a majority of whom shall constitute a quorum, who shall have the sole right of conducting the affairs of said Company, constructing said tram railway, conveying passengers thereon, and of leasing the same if they so elect. *Provided*, That for any distance between the termini of said railway, the charge for each passenger shall not exceed five cents.

SECT. 3. That the capital stock of said Company shall consist of four thousand shares, which the stockholders, if they find it expedient, may increase from time to time at any annual or special meeting, upon a vote of two-thirds of all the shares; and that the president and directors shall have power to borrow upon bonds, or other evidences of indebtedness, at such prices and rates of interest as they may deem advisable, not exceeding seven per cent. per annum, such sums as shall be requisite for the construction and completion of the said tram railway, and the necessary depots and structures, and for the equipment, administration, use and maintenance of the same. *Provided*, That said Company shall be subject in all respects to the several provisions of the general "Act regulating railroad companies," of February nineteenth, one thousand eight hundred and forty-nine, not inconsistent with this enactment.

SECT. 4. That the said Central Passenger Railway Company, before commencing to run their cars upon the said streets, shall, at the option of the owners of the lines of omnibuses licensed to run to West Philadelphia by the way of Chestnut street, also the line of omnibuses licensed to run on Walnut street, purchase the horses, omnibuses, sleighs and harness of the said lines, at a price to be assessed in the following manner: the said owners shall choose one disinterested person, and the said Company shall choose a second such person, and the persons thus chosen shall choose a third person,

and the valuation set by these persons shall be final and conclusive.

SECT. 5. The said railway shall be subject to the use of any part or parts thereof by any other passenger railway company, for the purpose of completing a route or making a circuit, upon such terms and conditions as may be agreed upon by such other company and the said Central Passenger Railway Company, and in case the said companies cannot agree, then upon such terms and conditions as may be prescribed by the Councils of the City of Philadelphia; and the West Philadelphia Passenger Railway Company is hereby authorized to connect their road with that of the Central Passenger Railway Company by single track on Twenty-third and Twenty-second streets. *And provided further*, That the said Company shall be subject to the provisions of an ordinance of the City Councils of Philadelphia in reference to passenger railways, approved seventh July, one thousand eight hundred and fifty-seven.

G. NELSON SMITH,

*Speaker pro tem. of the House of Representatives.*

WILLIAM H. WELSH,

*Speaker of the Senate.*

Approved the twenty-first day of April, A. D., one thousand eight hundred and fifty-eight.

WM. F. PACKER.

II.

# AN ORDINANCE

# TO REGULATE PASSENGER RAILWAYS.

---

Section 1. The Select and Common Councils of the City of Philadelphia do ordain, that all Passenger Railroad Companies within the City of Philadelphia shall be subject to the restrictions, limitations, terms and conditions hereinafter provided; and any such Company, before entering upon any road, street, avenue or alley, within the limits of said City, shall be understood, and deemed to be subject thereto, upon the conditions hereinafter prescribed.

Section 2. That it shall be the duty of said Companies, or any of them to conform to the surveys, regulations and gradients as they are now or may hereafter be established by law. They shall submit all proposed plans, courses, styles of rails, and the manner of laying the same, to the Board of Surveys and Regulations, for their approval and sanction, which shall be obtained before they proceed to break ground or occupy any of the highways as aforesaid; and they shall be further required to lay flag-stones or crossings along the line of the paved streets upon which the rails are laid, at intervals not exceeding two hundred and fifty feet; and any neglect, omission or refusal to do so on the part of any such Company, shall be punishable by a fine of not less than fifty dollars, for each and every offence, recoverable before any Alderman of the City of Philadelphia, and payable into the City Treasury.

Section 3. That all Railroad Companies, as aforesaid, shall be at the entire cost and expense of maintaining, paving, repairing and repaving that may be necessary upon any road, street, avenue or alley occupied by them. That for the convenience of the public, it shall also be the duty of such Companies to clear the streets, or other public highways that they may occupy, of snow or any obstructions placed therein by such Companies, when the same impedes the travel upon said highways, and for any neglect on their part to do so for a period of five days, they shall be punishable by a fine of twenty dollars for each square that may be so impeded, recoverable before any Alderman of the City of Philadelphia, and payable into the City Treasury, upon a complaint of five citizens residing therein, upon oath or affirmation: provided, nevertheless, that whenever any such Company shall deem it inexpedient to use their said road during the continuance of the snow, they shall provide comfortable sleighs, or other suitable vehicles for the transportation of passen-

gers along the route of their railway at the usual rates as aforesaid; then, and in that case, no such penalty shall be recoverable.

SECTION 4. That it shall be the duty of any Company, as aforesaid, when requested so to do by the Chief Commissioner of Highways, to remove any obstruction, mend or repair their road, pave or repave the highways, as herein before provided, and should they refuse or neglect to do so for ten days from the date of such notice, then and in such case the Councils may forbid the running of any car or cars upon the said road until the same is fully complied with; and the City reserves the right in all such cases to repair or repave such streets, and the expense thereof shall be a judgment upon the road, stock and effects of such Company, recoverable as judgments are now recoverable by the City of Philadelphia.

SECTION 5. It shall be the duty of said Company, or Companies, to employ careful, sober and prudent agents, conductors and drivers, to take charge of their car or cars when upon the road, and for the violation of any Act of Assembly, or Ordinance of the City, on the part of any such officer, or officers, or employees upon said road, the Company shall be liable to all fines, forfeitures or damages therefrom: provided, however, that this act shall not be taken to excuse or free any such officer or employee, from the penalties or responsibilities of any such violations, or other acts by them commited.

SECTION 6. The running speed of the cars, upon any City Passenger Railroad, shall not at any time be at a greater rate than six miles an hour, in the paved and built-up portions of the City, nor shall they incommode the crossings, nor stop at the corners of any street or elsewhere, to solicit passengers. It shall also be the duty of conductors and drivers of the cars to give ample notice to drivers of vehicles and pedestrians of their approach, and also to afford all reasonable opportunity for them, or either of them, to avoid collision or accident, and any neglect by them to comply with the provision of this section, shall be punished by a fine of five dollars, to be recovered before any Alderman of the City, and paid into the City Treasury, and the Mayor of the City is in such cases empowered to revoke the license of such car or cars, and they shall not be permitted to be again placed on the road until such license is renewed.

SECTION 7. It shall be incumbent on all Railroad Companies, as aforesaid, before placing cars upon their road, to pay into the office of the Chief Commissioner of Highways, and annually thereafter, for the use of the City, the sum of five dollars for each car intended to run on the same. They shall also have the number painted in some conspicuous place upon each car; and any omission, or neglect, to comply with either of these provisions, shall be punishable by a fine of ten dollars to be recovered on complaint before any Alderman of the City, who shall pay the same forthwith into the City Treasury.

SECTION 8. The Directors of any such Company, or Companies, shall, immediately after the completion of any Passenger Railroad in

the City, file, in the office of the City Solicitor, a detailed statement, under the seal of the Company, and certified under oath or affirmation by the President and Secretary, of the entire cost of the same; and the City of Philadelphia reserves the right any time to purchase the same, by paying the original cost of said road or roads, and cars, at a fair valuation. And any such Company, or Companies, refusing to consent to such purchase, shall thereby forfeit all privileges, rights and immunities they may have acquired in the use or possession of any of the highways as aforesaid; or should any such Company or corporation neglect to run cars upon their road or roads for the accommodation of the public, for the space of three consecutive months, the Councils reserve the right to rent the same to any other person or persons, company or companies, who will be willing to run cars on the same; or in the event of the Councils, as aforesaid, being unable to rent said road, or to place cars upon the same for one year after the same shall have been abandoned, as aforesaid, by the Company constructing or owning the same, then, and in such case, the Councils reserve the right to cause the said road to be removed from the highways, and to sell or dispose of the materials thereof, and after paying all expenses arising therefrom, pay the balance, if any, to the legal representatives of the said defaulting Company.

SECTION 9. Any Passenger Railroad Company, which is now or may hereafter be incorporated in the City of Philadelphia, shall, by their proper officer or officers, who shall sign the same, file in the office of the City Solicitor a written obligation to comply with the provisions of this Ordinance: provided, that no Railroad Company now incorporated shall be authorized to commence work upon any of the Highways of the City until this section has been complied with; and a failure to do so, for ten days, shall be taken and deemed as a refusal on the part of such Company; and in case the Philadelphia and Delaware River Railroad Company should fail to comply with the provisions of this section, on or before the eighth of July, proximo, the City Councils hereby express their disapproval of an Act, entitled "A Supplement to an Act to incorporate the Philadelphia and Delaware River Railroad Company," approved June 9, 1857, which provides for the construction of a Passenger Railway, by a private corporation, over Fifth and Sixth streets, in the City of Philadelphia.

JOHN MILLER,
*President of Common Council.*
G. M. WHARTON,
*President of Select Council.*

Approved the seventh of July, A. D., one thousand eight hundred and fifty-seven.

RICHARD VAUX,
*Mayor of Philadelphia.*

III.

# EDITORIAL OPINIONS SELECTED FROM THE PUBLIC PRESS OF PHILADELPHIA.

## From the Public Ledger.

"The application of the Passenger Railway Company, to the City Councils, to lay rails on Chestnut, and perhaps some other streets, will probably be made in a short time, and, as a matter of course, there is no doubt enough of old fogyism in that Body to give the application troublesome opposition, notwithstanding the great success of the Fifth and Sixth Street Railway, and the avidity with which the stock in the Second and Third Street and the Fairmount Roads have been taken up. The only objection to a railway on Chestnut street, that has come to our knowledge, is, that the street is already so much occupied, that there is not room in addition for a railway; those thus reasoning seemingly forgetting that a railway, instead of adding to the incumbrance on the street, will directly and largely lessen it. Instead of continuous trains of omnibuses, passing in opposite directions, and covering nearly the entire street, with a railway we shall have all that description of travel confined to a space of five or six feet wide in the centre of the street, and the whole of it passing in one direction. The remaining four-fifths of the street will be left to private and business travel, and will render Chestnut street, what it is so much desired it should be, the most attractive and fashionable thoroughfare in any city in the Union. With the omnibus removed, the street will be comparatively free of carriage travel. If any man doubts this fact, let him, for a single day, or a single hour, count the number that passes Fourth and Chestnut streets, and compare it with the aggregate of every other description of carriages passing within the same time. The monopoly, which the omnibus lines now hold, of the travel of Chestnut street, is scarcely credible. The very fact that Philadelphia's fashionable thoroughfare is a narrow street, is the strongest reason in favor of a passenger railway. Private carriages are now, to a great extent, excluded from the street, from fear of jams

and collisions with the coaches of the almost innumerable omnibus lines that throng it. Railway cars are not the slightest hindrance to carriage travel, as has been tested by the successful operation of the Fifth and Sixth Street Passenger Railway. Those streets are now sought by many of the carriages from the adjacent streets, being freer from obstruction, and the track forming an easy carriage way, while the rails are crossed at pleasure, without let or hindrance. In a word, all the objections urged to passenger railways in cities have proved, on experiment, the strongest reasons for their adoption, and apply with more force of reasoning to Chestnut street than to any other street in the city. As to the productiveness of these improvements, that seems to have been satisfactorily demonstrated by capitalists, the stock being taken as fast as offered. We do not know one of the corporators of these companies, and care not who they are, nor how strongly the City Councils may bind them under the law for the protection of public travel and the city's interest; but, for the interest and convenience of the great body of the public, for those who ride in their own vehicles, as well as those who travel by rail, and last, though not least, for the sake of maintaining Chestnut street as the fashionable thoroughfare, bringing all classes into it on a common level, it is greatly to be desired that Councils shall, with as little delay as possible, grant the permission solicited of them."

## From the Pennsylvanian.

"The bill to incorporate the Central Passenger Railroad Company, with power to lay a track on Chestnut and Walnut streets, has passed the Senate, under the provision, however, that the consent of Councils shall be obtained before the road is constructed.

We cannot admit the correctness of the arguments urged in opposition to this particular plan of the Chestnut street and Walnut street roads. If city railroads are improvements in one street, if they relieve the press of vehicles, remedying to a certain extent the evil of too narrow thoroughfares, if they tend to promote business and facilitate travel, they are improvements in all others similarly situated. Chestnut and Walnut streets are two of the main arteries of the city from east to west. Chestnut street, especially, is so crowded with omnibuses, and the bustle and noise occasioned in consequence

are so annoying and deafening, as to require speedy relief. Owners of property on Chestnut and Walnut streets, who oppose the introduction of passenger railroads, will, if they defeat the plan, find to their sorrow that they were mistaken. Mr. Ingram's remarks on this subject were, in our opinion, very sensible. He contended that if roads were constructed on Arch and Spruce streets, Chestnut and Walnut streets would be deserted if they did not follow the example."

## From the North American.

"Omnibuses, once so popular, are already voted to savor of old fogyism. To be sure, it is only a year or so since they were pointed at as an evidence of progress and enterprise; but times change as we all know, and men change with them. If we go on at the present rate, the omnibus will take its place amongst the obsolete, along with the old stage coach. People will ask if such a thing ever was. In fact, it will only survive in history, or in the soliloquies of some humorist, who sighs over its departed glory, and its decaying skeleton. The omnibus in Philadelphia will soon be an interesting theme for the local antiquary.

The Fifth and Sixth Street Railroad was wanted; and its construction was too long delayed; and we are of opinion that some others of the roads, which are proposed, are needed, and may be fairly remunerative.

There should be *trunks* of city railways, properly located, running north and south, east and west. These might be brought within easy walking distance of those who habitually resort from the suburbs to the *centres of population, amusement and business.*

Let all, that the public wants actually require, be provided, but it is scarcely worth while to lay them in every *lane and alley.* And if people must build railroads, *where there is no sort of occasion for them*, let them do it out of their own pockets, and at their own risk."

## From the Daily News.

"The Chestnut and Walnut street road is before the Railroad Committee of Councils, and we understand that the opponents were present in force at a meeting of the Committee,

which was held yesterday. The only objection, which is made on the part of the opponents, is, that they live on one or the other of the streets named, and that they don't want the road there. An elegant argument most certainly—what do the thousands of people, who are to have the benefits of these roads, care whether the 'Toodle' family 'want' them or not?

A very considerable, and indeed, extensive experience in the world has taught us that this community, above all others which have ever come under our notice, has been literally cursed with 'Toodles,' and that, for no other reason than that our people generally would seem disposed to place more reliance in such a creature, if it happens from any cause, or any source, to be well bespattered with money, than they would in a man of brains and intellect without it. The history of the recent revulsion, through which our community has been made to pass, is happily doing its work toward a correction of this matter, and there is scarcely a day passes but some new evidence is afforded of the fact that, in a very large number of cases, the men, who have been chosen as directors for railroads, banks, and other corporations, would have been better attended to, if they themselves had been placed in the hands of judicious and sensible guardians."

## From the Evening Bulletin.

"PROGRESS *vs.* FOGYISM.—Conservatism is a most excellent thing, when it does not conserve worn out and worthless things, and forbid new and useful ones. If the Americans in 1775 had all been conservatives, we might still be subjects of the British Crown. If the human race were always conservative, it might still be a slow-coach human race, steamboatless, railroadless, telegraphless. It could not honestly advertise itself, like a new house, as a human race having 'all the modern improvements.' If worlds were looking out for human races, no intelligent world would be willing to take such a good old-conservative human race as that would be.

Here in Philadelphia we have been intensely and ruinously conservative. We clung to cobble-stone pavements for years, as if the stones were the precious stones of the New Jerusalem, and some of us still glory in the delicious jolting over them, as being much better than the smooth passage over the

granite blocks or the iron rails. There are not wanting good, honest, old conservative citizens, who still sit down and mourn over the days that are gone, when Philadelphia was a small city; when it had a dozen distinct governments; when it had not a mile of railroad, an inch of telegraph, or a single steamboat; when there were even no omnibuses and no gas-lights; when watchmen made night hideous by their unearthly wailings of the hour, and when the community was in the full enjoyment of all the blessings of 'the good old times.'

It is still said that Passenger Railways are an injury to the street, whilst property holders and shopkeepers along Fifth and Sixth streets, instead of feeling themselves injured, advertise that the cars pass their doors every five minutes.

The rails are found to offer no obstacle whatever to the travel of the streets. In fact we notice that the drivers of other vehicles take advantage of every opportunity to get upon the track, and they run along smoothly and rapidly upon the rails. We have observed, too, that when it is necessary for these vehicles to turn-off, they have no difficulty whatever in getting upon the paving stones again. To ordinary wheels the elevated portion of the rail offers little or no obstacle, and it is already demonstrated that, so far as the road itself is concerned, it does not interfere in the slightest degree with the travel of the streets.

Omnibuses have really retrograded of late, instead of keeping pace with the demands of the age. In former years they were attended by boys, who acted as conductors, and while these youngsters were taking fares and attending to the picking up and setting down of passengers, the driver was enabled to look to his horses and get over the route at a faster rate than if he were compelled to perform the double duty of 'Cad' and driver. It would be a far easier task to tell the faults which have *not* crept into the omnibus system, than to give a catalogue of the abuses which now beset it and annoy every citizen who is compelled to use these vehicles for the want of means of conveyance better suited to the requirements of the public. The habit of loitering on the way so as to pick up every possible passenger—without regard to the loss of time to those already in the coach, and without respect to the number of persons who are thus deterred from riding at all—is a serious evil; and an ordinarily active man can now walk a mile or two, in any direction, from the Exchange, in less time than the lumbering slow omnibuses will convey him the same distance. The carrying of trunks and

huge bundles, to save niggardly persons the expense of porterage, is another absolute nuisance, and we know of citizens who patronize coaches two or three squares out of their way, to avoid lines which suffer this freight-carrying to be done extensively.

The modern plan of collecting fares is one of the most annoying features of the omnibus system. The driver is compelled to take the fares and give change while attending to his horses in a crowded street, and some good natured passenger, who sits conveniently to the pay-hole, is generally required to be the go-between for the payer and the driver, and perform the work that should be done by a person employed for the purpose. The proprietors have adopted precautions such as dial registers, and spies along their routes, to secure themselves from being cheated by the drivers, but we have yet to hear of the first step being taken towards the protection of the passengers themselves from imposition.

Omnibuses are awkward to get into or out of, and after the getting into of one has been accomplished, but little comfort is found in them, especially in wet weather, when there is scarcely a spot in the majority of the coaches that is not visited by the drippings from the roof. These uncouth vehicles cannot be stopped in any reasonable space; their rolling and pitching prevent the coach from starting until a passenger is seated, nor is it prudent to make a move towards getting out, until the coach comes to a dead stand-still. The effect of all this is to make the stopping and starting, and the taking up or setting down of a passenger, a work of time, particularly when Jehu is compelled to attend to collecting the fares, and to making change with his clumsy fingers, while the horses jog leisurely along.

The construction of passenger railway cars is a security against many of these anoyances; platforms near the ground, the absence of rolling and pitching, an easily managed brake, and a conductor to attend to the fares, &c., tend greatly to the saving of time and the avoidance of delays.

The railroad cars when drawn by horses are more humane than the old fashioned vehicles; since, in a general calculation, we may fairly assume that whatever promises more convenience, diminishes pain.

There is a Morning-Red of a happier life, and it is the hand of science, of combined effort, intellectual and physical, slowly acquiring the most methodical way of working, which is gradually rescuing humanity from its great foes of inhumanity and pain."

## From the Evening Argus.

"The Central Passenger Railroad.—Some time since a list of *names* of entire *respectability* was published in one of our evening papers.

It is again published in pamphlet form, entitled a 'Remonstrance against the Central Passenger Railroad.' It is a collection of *names* under a simple negative.

The right of petition is undoubtedly a valuable one, but, when a certain list of *names*, upon a certain street, is thus placed in a position adverse to a general interest, and, without stating any objection, rests simply upon the supposed power of an aristocratical negative, the petition becomes a little oligarchical.

It becomes a questionable instrument in a democratic community.

There can, beyond this, be no objection to these gentlemen embalming their names for posterity, but it may be as well to correct an error into which they seem to have fallen.

'The streets of Philadelphia are public thoroughfares.'

'The citizens of each section have the same rights in every street with the citizens of every other section.'

These propositions have never been questioned, since the chains were removed from the churches, till to-day.

The public, therefore, are not obliged to consult the wishes of every man whose house stands on a public thoroughfare.

They are not obliged to consult these 'remonstrants' either, as to what conveyance they shall use, or of what the streets shall be made, whether of wood, stone, or iron. The city would come to a stand-still directly, if put at the mercy of some gouty, or stupid old fellow, who owned twenty or two hundred feet upon a public thoroughfare.

It is not necessary he should be gouty or stupid—it is quite sufficient if he be *respectable* or *intelligent*, since these men, who are both, undertake to remonstrate against a more convenient mode of travel, because it proposes to pass the thoroughfares on which they live.

We confess the remonstrance occasions us no surprise—it is no novelty.

The same kind of opposition, from the same feelings, has for many years encountered every enterprise of general utility.

If Philadelphia does go slowly and surely by the board,

she may thank some of her so-called *respectable* and *intelligent* citizens for their devotion to private interest in the face of public good.

Many years ago the question arose whether the city should be provided with a general supply of water, to be brought from the Wissahicon, or some other neighboring stream.

Its object was to give to the community at large the convenience of pure water, enjoyed by those who had wells in their large gardens.

It will scarcely be credited that this measure was fifty years in its accomplishment, and that it was consummated in the face of a most disheartening opposition from the *intelligent* and *respectable* owners of private wells. The watering committee went to Fairmount before daylight, for fear of being mobbed; they could not leave their house-doors without insults from their neighbors; and at one period, while the works were at Centre Square, they were obliged to give their own individual notes to sustain the enterprise. To furnish each citizen a copious supply of water, just as to furnish him with a cheap mode of conveyance, is a proposition so unobjectionable, that opposition could hardly have been anticipated —reasons there were none—but these gentlemen had private wells.

When it was proposed to light the city with gas, it brought out among the opposition a name as *respectable* and *intelligent* as any Philadelphia ever had. According to the custom of their ancestors, the opponents of gas retired early; besides, their houses had private lamp-posts, and their carriages had private lamps.

The 'Vox populi vox Dei' said, however, let there be light—and the owl-like eyes of old-fogyism were dazzled with the new wonder, and now necessity, of the gas lamp.

The common school system, by which a petty pedagogueism in sectional buildings was superseded, met the same opposition. *Respectability* had its private tutors; the public schools were for the lower orders; *respectability* declined supporting them.

In other words, education (the founders of the common school system determined) should be lifted from its dead-language lethargy, and made a practicable benefit for all classes; and this *respectability* opposed. The cause of common sense and common right triumphed again, and the people's school and the people's college have supplanted the system of incommunicable *respectability* in verbs and prepositions.

When Philadelphia required a great avenue to the West, when her trade was languishing, and when enterprising rivals were grasping and holding with a determined hand what was rightfully her own, the merchants of Philadelphia asked aid of the city for the Pennsylvania Railroad, and the same *respectable* and *intelligent* source announced it contrary to law.

One Lord Coke, who lived some centuries ago, and never saw a railroad, or was capable of having an idea of its advantages, had written some chapters on real estate, which rendered it quite impossible to build a road to Pittsburg. All the *respectable* gentlemen who had mortgages listened to this old oracle with great reverence, and got out their remonstrance.

The Councils, meanwhile, not having the fear of my Lord Coke before their eyes, built the road, and conferred a lasting benefit on the city.

Wells of dirty water and obsolete wooden pumps, oil lamps, uneducated little boys running the streets, horse boats, and Conestoga teams; these results were prayed for by *respectable* remonstrants.

And now they are out again in favor of omnibuses, the Conestoga teams of our local travel.

They propose to break down an enterprise of like utility and general benefit with these, by destroying its main feature —the Chestnut and Walnut Street Railroad—they propose to confine the acknowledged advantages of Passenger Railroads to the north, south, and east section of the city.

They propose to deprive the great central mass of our population, who throng Chestnut street, of a convenient mode of travel, thereby keeping Chestnut street a blind alley in the midst of the city.

Now, this is all very well for professional people whose interest in a street lies within the compass of four blocks, and for retired gentlemen, who live within the smell of their own stables.

But we ask those of the merchants on Chestnut street, who have lent their names to this remonstrance, whether they consult their true interests in preventing additional facilities for the large class of customers who reside at a distance; and whether, while Eighth and Tenth, Second and Third, Spruce and Pine, Race and Vine streets, are being built up by those improvements, they will be content to stand-still and hold the carriage doors of these remonstrants?

It seems to us it is an improvement so palpably of advantage to all, that you, gentlemen, at least should see it.

It substitutes, instead of the rattle and confusion of rival lines of omnibuses lumbering up the street, a passenger car, running at stated intervals in one direction.

It affords you a convenient, pleasant, and rapid transit from your places of business to your homes—and to your customers a convenience which must largely increase your business.

In consideration of these advantages to yourselves, even if it were an obstruction to carriages, you would do unwisely in opposing it—but that this is not the case, has been fully tested on Fifth street. Between Chestnut and Walnut streets, there is a cab stand along half the square. The Mayor's office, the United States Court, the Dispensary, the Franklin Library, a leading jewelry store, and various offices along the east side, are rarely without carriages before their several doors; and yet not the slightest inconvenience has been felt by any one residing on that square. This, it seems to us, should end all opposition upon this ground; but perhaps it will not—and if it does, it will not convert the *intelligent, respectable* remonstrants. They will not see it—they will oppose it. Copies of the remonstrance will be found in their pockets, we doubt not, when they take their seats for the first time in the Chestnut and Walnut Street Passenger Cars."

## From the Evening Journal.

"Passenger Railway in Chestnut and Walnut Streets. —In the midst of the fights as to who shall build our city passenger railways, we are in danger of not having them built at all. The roads are a necessity of the times, and they must be introduced wherever they are needed for travel within the city, however they may be delayed by private prejudice or interest. As regards the proposed line on Walnut and Chestnut streets, we think that cars, running on a single straight track, and carrying, each, thirty or forty passengers, would relieve the crowded state of the highways named, instead of obstructing them. We would substitute, in effect, one vehicle for many—that is to say, the railway omnibus, pursuing one direct path, would supersede a hundred straggling platoons of ordinary omnibuses. Hence, with an equal or greater amount of travel, the thoroughfares would be less occupied, with much less noise, dust, obstruction, and wear and tear. In addition

to these advantages, the public would gain time, with increased comfort, in the improved mode of locomotion. On the simple ground, therefore, of economizing space in our main avenues, and saving money to the people in the cost of repairs, we are in favor of a passenger railway in Walnut and Chestnut streets."

## From the Public Ledger.

"The policy of passenger railways is clearly acknowledged, not only by the Legislature and Councils of the city, but by the great majority of the people. Petty objections from small minds may be thrown in the way as stumbling blocks in particular localities, but, as the policy has been acknowledged an improvement, railways are certain to find their way, eventually, into every street, on which they are now authorized, and into as many more as time and occasion may prove necessary for public convenience. The construction of the great Birmingham railway, England, the first of its kind, provoked against its projectors the indignation and opposition of the same class of small minds that now interpose to stay the introduction of passenger railways in cities. The interesting letters of Bayard Taylor,* in course of publication in the New York Tribune,

---

* The following are extracts from Bayard Taylor's letters in the *Tribune*—referred to by the *Ledger:*

"RHITHYMNOS, Island of Crete,
Saturday, Feb. 20, 1858.

My plan of travel, on leaving Kbania, was to visit the wild mountain region of Sfakia, which lies beyond the White Mountains, in the south-western corner of the island. The passes of the White Mountains are difficult at all seasons, and I ascertained that the *xyloscala*, or, 'wooden ladder,' by which I had intended to reach that district, was not to be reached on account of the snow; but there is another road around the eastern base of the mountains, and I determined to try it.

The Pasha endeavored to dissuade me from the attempt. 'The roads in Crete,' said he, 'are absolutely frightful; and though as a traveller, you must be prepared for any experience, yet, when the season is bad, they become quite impassable, even to the natives. I have had a carriage road surveyed and located from here to Heracleon, and a small portion of it is already finished, near Rhithymnos; but the people oppose it with all their might, and at least five or six years must elapse before enough is done to demonstrate to them the use and value of of such improvements. I am satisfied that Turkey

represent similar opposition, by the natives of some of the benighted islands in the Mediterranean, through which he is travelling, to the efforts made by English engineers to improve, by turnpiking, their almost impassable roads. They are mobbed, their tools stolen and broken, and personal violence threatened, precisely as was done to the illustrious Stephenson, when, with the most determined energy, he labored to demonstrate the utility of railways for burthen trains, and steam as a motive power in driving them. Where are the shallow-minded opponents of railways and locomotives now? Just where the few opponents of passenger railways will be, when all our more public thoroughfares are occupied by them, as they are destined soon to be. Improvements, like revolutions, never go backward, and though some few persons may make an unenviable notoriety, by impeding the laying of the rails on some of the streets, as authorized by the Legislature, the work, sooner or later, is very sure to be accomplished. Unfortunately for the establishment of the passenger railway improvement, the greatest opposition is to the roads on streets where they are most needed, and where they will work the greatest good, namely, on the narrow and most thronged carriage-ways. If there is any one street in our city, on which a railway more than any other will meet the wants of the people, and at the same time profit those living and doing business on it, it is Chestnut street. Instead of opposition, the business men on it should give it the utmost encouragement; for, just so sure as the travel, brought from the southern and northern extremes of the city to the centre, is forced down any other street, Arch or Walnut, just so sure will traders and business men go to such central thoroughfare to meet it

---

will never advance until she has means of communication sufficient to make her internal resources available.'"

"MELIDONI, Island of Crete,
February 25th, 1858.

Toward evening, we received a visit from Mr. Woodward, the English engineer who has charge of the new road. He has been a year and a half in Crete, and seemed very glad to get a chance of speaking his own language again. His account of the people went very far to confirm my own impressions. They are violently opposed to improvement of any kind, and the road, especially, excites their bitterest hostility. They steal his flag-poles, try to break his instruments, and even went so far as to attack his person. He is obliged to carry on the work under the protection of a company of Albanian soldiers."

and supply it; and what is now blindly spurned by the few on Chestnut street, hundreds of thousands of dollars could be well afforded to be given, in less than ten years, to have exclusively, as now offered. From the day that Councils decide not to grant the great central link of railway to Chestnut street, (which we cannot believe they ever will,) and some other adjacent parallel street secures it, from that hour may be dated the decay of the one, and the growth in value and importance of the other. For the corporators of the proposed railway, or the manner of construction and connection with other lines, we have nothing to say. That, it is proper for Councils, under the law, to look closely to, and so guard, as that private rights shall be best protected and public convenience most accommodated. What we desire, and what the best interests of the city, and of Chestnut street in particular, most require, is the freest and widest extension of passenger railways."

IV.

# COMMUNICATIONS SELECTED FROM THE PUBLIC PRESS OF PHILADELPHIA.

---

## "The Omnibus *vs.* The City Railroads.

Since the progressionists have made it fashionable to turn all our streets into railroads, and to cry down the omnibus, I wish to say a word in behalf of the latter.

It will, I hope, be a long while before the citizens of Philadelphia will be contented to endure such a nuisance as the railroad is likely to be. Look at the Third street, the Market street, the Broad street, and the Willow street railroads. Are they not unmitigated nuisances? Everybody knows they are, and yet a set of speculators would make all the streets in the city just like these, to the inconvenience of the public, and to the damage of property.

What is the use of experience, if we go directly counter to the lessons it teaches? Who would believe that any set of men could be found, so desperate and so defiant of the sense of the public on this question, as to insist upon laying a railroad in two of the best streets in the city, viz.:—Chestnut and Walnut streets?

Yet it is so. A charter has actually been granted to a company to perpetrate this great outrage, and it is likely to be accomplished, unless the people speak out.

I am an omnibus man, and am opposed to railroads; and while I am content to remedy any defects of the present omnibus system, I protest against their being driven out of the streets.

Let us consider what are the objections to the omnibus, and suggest the remedy. It is said, and the charge, I confess, has some weight, that in Chestnut street particularly, they occupy the entire street, lumbering about, careless of all other

vehicles, first on one side, then on the other, so that it is dangerous to attempt to drive a private carriage through the street at all. Let us learn wisdom of our enemies. It would be certainly desirable, if practicable, to compel all the omnibus drivers—a very reliable and compliant set of men—to keep their unwieldy machines exactly in the middle of the street, imitating in this respect the railroad. If this were done, then everybody would know how to pass them. Fast young men and tigers could show their skill in driving their light wagons within an inch of the omnibus, on a full trot, without danger of being crushed, as now, by a lee lurch of the great battering ram. To insure this end I would pass an ordinance, and impose a fine upon every Jehu that did not comply with the rule.

It may be objected that the drivers could not, if they would, keep the exact middle line of the street. I am ready to meet this objection. Take two metal bars, nearly flat, and lay them at a proper distance apart, so that the wheels could travel on them; the horses would naturally keep between them. This would have the effect also of diminishing the terrible noise the vehicle now makes over the rough stones. To prevent the wheels running off the metal bars or slabs, a slight projection might be made on each, say about seven-eighths of an inch high, and, if you please, let the wheels have a corresponding rim on their tires. This device, as any one may see, would effectually prevent the omnibus from wabbling from curve to curve, and surging through holes and over loose stones.

It is evident too, that, owing to the ease with which great weights may be pulled over smooth surfaces, a desirable modification of the present 'bus may be made. The wheels can be much smaller, and the frame let down lower, so that feeble persons and children may be able to use this mode of conveyance, to which they have hitherto been almost debarred, owing to the difficulty of ascent to the back door. The omnibus could also be much enlarged without increasing its weight—thus affording room for a greater number of passengers—a very important matter in a hot summer day and when it is raining.

I think I discover a smile on the lips of the scorner of my proposed improvement, inasmuch as I have provided for the omnibus keeping the exact centre of the street, but not for their passing each other in opposite directions. I anticipate the sneering criticism, and have the remedy at hand. I

am not ashamed to avail myself of a good idea, although it comes from the enemy. Let all the omnibuses run up Chestnut street and down Walnut, or vice versa, completing the circuit by using the cross streets at either end. The system will then be complete; and with this improvement, easily brought about, I defy the opponents of the omnibus to point out a single remaining objection. Why then insist upon having railroads, when it is well known there are so many respectable people opposed to them, so that the very name is detestable. Witness the immense list of remonstrances against the Chestnut and Walnut street Company laying rails in those streets. The improved omnibus system will satisfy the entire community. Nine out of ten of these remonstrants will, if they have the opportunity, petition Councils to adopt my plan, in the place of the horrid railroad. No one will be silly enough to assert that this system will injure the property of those living on the streets where it is introduced; on the contrary, it will enhance the value of it. All complaints against the old rudderless monster—as I once heard a malicious railroad man call that highly respectable public vehicle, the omnibus—will be at an end; and it will hardly be recognized by its old admirers, in its improved shape and parts.

Again, the railroad in the hands of a company is a perfect monopoly; and, although their advocates boast that they help the income of the City Treasury and diminish the taxes, by keeping the streets in good repair at their own expense, yet the people very properly object to monopolies.

Now, there is no reason why a revenue of the same sort, and a stipulation to keep the streets in order, may not be equally well secured under my proposed new omnibus system. Charge twenty-five dollars per annum for the privilege for each omnibus, and compel the owners to keep the streets in order.

This could not, perhaps, be done, without concert of action between the several owners; but to insure its being carried out, I would suggest that a number of individuals club together, and take certain streets, and that Councils recognize the club and hold them jointly responsible. This would be a very different concern from an incorporated company. The former consists of individual citizens; the latter is a monopoly, and have the right, by an act of the Legislature, to use a great seal.

Of course, the railroad advocates will find or try to invent some objections to my plan; but I appeal to every reflecting

man, if it does not possess all the merits claimed for the railroad, and at the same time preserve all the good characteristics of the omnibus, with none of its disadvantages.

Gentlemen, in their private carriages, may then have some satisfaction in driving through Chestnut street. There will be no more noise, no blockading the street; people may converse and read newspapers in the omnibus; ladies' dresses will not be splashed with dirty water from the gutters; the street will be inviting; shopping will be pleasant pastime, and everybody will be pleased with the change.

Thus, I have proved that we can do without the railroad. Some one may say, 'a rose by any other name will smell as sweet;' but people will have their fancies, their notions, or, if you please, their prejudices. Let no one do unnecessary violence to them. If my improved omnibus system will answer and satisfy both parties, why insist upon having a railroad? Let the streets be used for what they were intended, for

OMNIBUS."

## "The Right of Passing over the Soil.

The remarks of your correspondent E., in Friday's paper, I cannot say I perfectly understand, nor do I think any one else can. For instance, he says:—'The owners of property adjoining a street are the owners of the soil over which the street passes, and they have also *a private right of way*, which is *created by the deed from the State* or *the proprietaries*—this is *by a contract*, which the State Legislature is constitutionally prohibited from violating.' I must confess that I do not perfectly understand him in these remarks. Each citizen has a right of way, but it is in common with the public, as I think I shall be able to show. It is an undoubted principle of law, that the owners of land, over which a street has been laid, have the fee and the property and possession, as far as these rights do not interfere with the right of way of the public. In England, and perhaps most of the United States, this principle is in full force; but in this State it is different, and I think your idea and that of the public is not so erroneous as he imagines. He has evidently forgotten that the streets in the city of Philadelphia were laid out over the proprietaries' own land—for in 'certain conditions or concessions agreed upon by William Penn, Proprietary and Governor of the

Province of Pennsylvania, and those who are the adventurers and purchasers in the same Province, the 11th July, 1681, it is agreed—First. That so soon as it pleaseth God that the above-said persons arrive, then a quantity of land or ground plat shall be laid out for a large town or city, in the most convenient place upon the river for health and navigation; and every purchaser and adventurer shall by lot have so much land therein as will answer to the proportion which he hath bought or taken up upon rent. But it is to be *noted* that the *surveyors* shall consider what roads or highways will be necessary to the cities, towns or through the lands. Great roads, from city to city, not to contain less than forty feet in breadth, *shall be first laid out and declared to be for highways, before the dividend of acres be laid out for the purchaser, and the like observation to be had for the streets* in the towns and *cities*, that there may be convenient roads and streets, not to be encroached upon by any planter, &c.'

This shows most conclusively as to those streets (ancient streets) laid out in the plan of the city by Penn, (for the large town or city upon the river is Philadelphia,) that the fee was and remained in the proprietary and his heirs until the divesting act of 27th November, 1779, when it passed to the Commonwealth. As to the streets not laid out in this plan by Penn, from the year 1712, it was the custom of the proprietaries, and afterwards of the Commonwealth, to allow to all grantees of vacant land, without charge, an addition, in the proportion of six acres in every one hundred, for roads and highways, so that the original purchasers received one hundred and six acres and paid for one hundred. For the purpose of public roads, land could be taken without paying any compensation to the owners; accordingly, in 1699, it was ordered that the king's highways and public roads should be laid out by an order from the Governor and Council, without mentioning or giving any compensation to the owners, and the only reason that compensation is given now is for the improvements by clearing, &c., and, frequently, nothing is given, if the value of the property is increased by the street or highway.

The late Chief Justice Gibson, in one of his able opinions, remarks: 'In England, a highway is the property of the king, as *parens patriæ*, or universal trustee; in Pennsylvania it is the property of the people, not of a particular district, but of the whole State, who, constituting, as they do, the legitimate sovereign, may dispose of it by their representa-

tives, and at their pleasure. Highways, therefore, being the universal property of the State, are subject to its absolute direction and control. No person, natural or corporate, has an exclusive interest in the trust, unless she has granted it to him. Her right extends even to the soil, being an equivalent for the six per cent. thrown into every public grant, as compensation for what may be reclaimed for roads, and she has acted on the basis of it, for though damages for special injuries to improvements have been allowed by the general road-laws, nothing has been given for the use of the ground.'

M. L."

V.

# REAL ESTATE FRONTING UPON THE CENTRAL RAILWAY.

I certify, the distance, from the west side of Second street to the east side of Twenty-third street, *exclusive of streets*, to be eight thousand, five hundred and thirty-eight feet, two and one half inches, (8,538 feet, $2\frac{1}{2}$ inches,) and from the north side of Walnut street to the south side of Chestnut street, to be five hundred and ten feet, (510 feet.)

STRICKLAND KNEASS.
*Chief Engineer and Surveyor.*

| | Feet |
|---|---|
| Chestnut street from Second to Twenty-third, | 8,538 |
| Walnut " " " " " | 8,538 |
| Second " " Chestnut to Walnut, | 510 |
| Twenty-third street from " " " | 510 |
| Double this to obtain the number of feet on both sides of the street, | 18,096 |
| | 18,096 |
| Total feet of Real Estate fronting upon the route of the Central Railway. | 36,192 |
| Of those, expressing in writing their *anxious desire* for the *immediate* construction of this railway, there are appended to petitions the names of owners and residents representing, as near as can be ascertained, about | 14,200 |
| Those who have given verbally their approval represent about | 5,000 |
| The city, which has spoken loudly in the affirmative on this question, through its representatives in the Legislature, answers for about | 2,992 |
| Stated to be opposed, about | 14,000 |
| Total feet fronting upon the route, as certified by the City Surveyor, see ante, | 36,192 |

VI.

# EVIDENCE
# DISPROVING THAT PASSENGER RAILWAYS INTERFERE WITH THE ORDINARY BUSINESS OF THE STREET.

## Fifth and Sixth Street Residents.

The undersigned do not hesitate to say, that the Passenger Railroad, before their doors, has *not* proved to be the inconvenience many anticipated it would be; *that it does not impede the movements of other vehicles, nor prevent them from standing before the doors, nor in way interrupt the business of the street—on the contrary*, that it is *greatly* to be preferred to lines of omnibuses.

*Philadelphia, June*, 1858.

Robert Smith, Brewer, Fifth and Minor streets.
R. G. Gray, Brewer, 28 south Sixth street.
Chas. Magarge, Paper and Rag Merchant, 30 south Sixth st
M. G. Condon, Paper and Rag Merchant, 17 south Sixth st.
D. Landreth & Son, Agricul. Implements, 23 south Sixth st.
P. S. Duval & Son, Lithographers, Fifth and Minor streets.
And other merchants.

Garrick Mallery, 221 south Sixth street.
Wm. Henry Rawle, S. E. corner of Sixth and Adelphi sts.
W. L. Hirst, 212 south Sixth street.
Chas. H. Muirheid, 203 south Sixth street.
David Webster, 130 south Sixth street.
Chapman Biddle, 131 south Fifth street.
Aubrey H. Smith, 137 south Fifth street.
J. H. Markland, 135 south Fifth street.
And other professional gentlemen and residents of private houses.

## Professional Opinion.

The advantage of a railroad car over an omnibus, as now used, is self-evident, not only to the passengers, but to *those who may reside upon the streets* through which the route may be located.

They are, *in crowded thoroughfares*, attended with much less danger than vehicles of ordinary construction and similar motive power.

Their introduction will prevent the streets being, as now, blocked by a double, and frequently a treble row of coaches, creating an intolerable annoyance to the business man, and will afford to the community greater accommodations in every particular wherein they consider the present system advantageous.

The mere circumstance of having a railroad track, properly constructed, upon a street, which to many seems an insuperable objection, is, in my opinion, none whatever, when that track is used solely by horse power. One great difficulty regarding its introduction, is to dispel from the minds of those who are most strenuous in their opposition, the idea of an extended train of heavily laden cars, drawn at a great and unmanageable velocity by steam power, or where this extreme is not reached, we have the effect of the imperfect track on Third street to combat; but, the roads under consideration are for the use of the same motive power as the carriage for which is claimed the exclusive right of the highways, and offers less obstruction and danger than an omnibus, whose course is erratic, frequently producing a fractured axle or wheel when least expected.

The objection to a single track in the middle of a fifty feet street, as interfering with the requirements of adjoining tenements, is one which will be waived so soon as the experiment is made, for in all cases the carriage-way is twenty-six feet wide, giving a clear space on each side of the rails of ten feet five inches, and of the cars in passing—which is but momentary—nine feet six inches, sufficient for all household purposes, and offers no impediment to builders when occupying the street with materials of construction, as it infringes but six inches upon the distance from curb, now allowed them by law.

The further objection, that the passage of cars will interfere with the traffic upon the highways is equally untenable, as they will, in fact, be advantageous in keeping the current more perfect; for, should a street be occupied to its legal limits with building materials, there is but room for the passage of *two vehicles;* they are, therefore, confined to specified tracks when there are no rails, then why not allow one stream of carriages to take the rails and follow or precede the car—collisions would be less frequent, and the constant jams, caused by three coaches endeavoring to pass through a space sufficiently wide for two only, would be prevented.

The only objection that has tenure is, that furniture cars and drays will infringe upon the line of rails when backed to the curb. This is by no means serious, for it is never necessary for them to remain in that position so long a time as to seriously delay the car, if compelled to wait even until the load be completed or delivered.

STRICKLAND KNEASS,
*Civil Engineer.*

## VII.

# RETRENCHMENT OF THE PAVING EXPENSES.

---

DEPARTMENT OF SURVEYS.

Office of the Chief Engineer and Surveyor.

*Philadelphia, June 29th*, 1858.

DEAR SIR:

In reply to your query, as to what the saving, per mile, per year, of expense for repairs of paving, would be to the city, consequent upon the construction of passenger railroads— I have to say, I regret much that the accounts of repairs, in the city departments, have been so kept as to preclude *such, accurate information* being obtained, yet I have no hesitation in saying that, on a thoroughfare that is used for a *single* omnibus line, the circumstance of taking off the omnibus coach, and providing a *permanent tramway* for the wheels of the ordinary vehicle would so reduce the annual expense to the city, as to warrant their introduction, even supposing the matter of general repair, and care of the *street entire*, was not in charge of the railroad company so occupying it.

Very respectfully,

STRICKLAND KNEASS,

*Chief Engineer and Surveyor.*

## VIII.

# DAMAGE TO WALLS FROM VIBRATION CAUSED BY OMNIBUSES.

*Philadelphia, June* 29, 1858.

In another respect, and one that has escaped the attention of most persons, the advantages of the smooth rail and small friction of cars, over the rough boulder-stones and the jar occasioned by the omnibus, are neither few nor unimportant. Any one, conversant with the laws of momentum, can readily understand the effect of the constant agitation and jar in our buildings, occasioned by omnibus travel, and particularly in streets where there is so much of it, as in Walnut and Chestnut; nor does it require a nice calculation to ascertain what the effects are in *any place*, where the subsoil is of such a character as to conduct the concussion to the walls and floors of buildings.

If, however, happily, any serious effects are escaped in solid buildings, there are many minor disturbances, if not so dangerous, almost as annoying—such as the constant vibration of pier-glasses, gas pipes, &c., (as occasional showers of white flakes, and plaster fragments attest,) without enumerating the general discomforts to the sedentary and delicate.

The absence of almost all friction, between the smooth planes of the car-wheels and the rail, obviates all these evils, by removing their cause.

A half-ounce hammer, struck continuously on a point, will disturb its inertia more in a given time, than ten tons in a state of repose on the same point.

GORDON PARKER CUMMINGS, *Architect & Civil Eng.*
JOHN M'ARTHUR, JR., *Architect.*
S. D. BUTTON, *Architect.*
ALEXANDER EASTON, *Civil Engineer.*
COLLINS & AUTENRIETH, *Architects.*
N. LE BRUN, *Architect.*
G. RUNGE, *Architect.*
J. C. HOXIE, *Architect.*

## IX.

# EVIDENCE

# DISPROVING THE DEPRECIATION OF

# REAL ESTATE

# UPON THE LINE OF PASSENGER RAILWAYS.

---

The signatures appended to the following letters are as well and favorably known in New York, as are in Philadelphia such names as Charles Henry Fisher, Francis M. Drexel, and James Dundas.

*People's Bank, New York, February* 16, 1856.

WILLIAM EBBETT, ESQ.

DEAR SIR:

In answer to your inquiry as to the effect our city railroads have had upon the value of real estate and the business interests of our city, I beg to reply, that I am clearly of the opinion that the establishment of the various lines of railroad, leading from the lower and business portions of the town, to the upper part of the city, mainly devoted to residences, has had a *material and visible effect upon the value of property,* especially in the northern part of the city.

The convenience and comfort of our citizens is greatly promoted by the safe and rapid transit in the cars, and I am fully satisfied, that, were the question submitted to a vote of our citizens, *ninety-nine* out of every *hundred* would be favorable to the railroads.

I remain, your ob't s't,

JOHN P. YELVERTON.

132 *Fifth Avenue, New York, February* 16, 1856.

WM. EBBETT, ESQ.,

*Superintendent Sixth Avenue Railroad Company, New York.*

DEAR SIR:

Your note of this day, requesting my opinion of city railroads, has been received, and in answer I remark, that my *impressions have entirely changed*, from those I formerly held about their usefulness and benefit; as regards the improvement of property, city railroads running over our avenues, and through the wide streets, have, in my opinion, benefitted and improved the value of property. The increase of building and the improvement in rents on the lines *are convincing evidences* of my remarks. Where the road is obliged to pass narrow streets the property is not improved, *in proportion*, to the more capacious thoroughfares. To the public they have become so necessary, that where punctuality and convenience are required, they will not be discontinued, but increase, until we have a perfect net work of roads over the city.

Respectfully your obedient,

SIDNEY MASON.

*Fifth Avenue, New York, February* 18, 1856.

MR. WM. EBBETT,

*Superintendent Sixth Avenue Railroad Company, New York.*

DEAR SIR:

You ask my opinion to the following inquiries:

Are railroads beneficial or injurious to cities, in a public point of view, or in a general sense?

Are they injurious to property on the line of such roads?

In narrow streets are they more objectionable than omnibuses, and, provided the track is single, will they in this case impede, to any serious extent, the ordinary transit over the same?

To the two first interrogatories I answer, from observation and reflection, that they are of great benefit. The present winter has confirmed me in this belief. That such roads tend to *increase the value* of the real estate, situate on the avenues and streets of ordinary width in this city, is shown

by the rise of property on and near the same. In narrow streets such may not be the case.

I have no hesitation in saying, that, in the streets, which are of no greater width than Varick, and even less, the car is less objectionable than the omnibus; for the track can be so arranged as to allow the space necessary for all sorts of vehicles, of the usual width, to pass; and experience has shown that, though in some respects objectionable, the car occasions less delay and injury, than the omnibus; as is shown by the daily observations of those whose attention has been and is directed to this subject.

As your questions are general, I answer in like manner. It would not be difficult to enlarge on either topic, and give, more specially, reasons in support of the views above expressed. I am, dear sir, respectfully yours,

FREDERIC DE PEYSTER.

*Lovejoy's Hotel, New York, February* 18, 1856.

WM. EBBETT, ESQ.

DEAR SIR:

I am in receipt of your note of to-day, requesting my opinion of the effect of city railroads upon the value of property, and business pursuits, and I have to reply, that *the unfavorable impressions,* which I had previously received, *have been entirely changed* by subsequent observation and experience. I have now no hesitation in saying that I believe that the advantages, to be derived from our city railroads, so far as they *beneficially affect the value of property generally,* and facilitate the movements of the business man, are *very great.*

Speedy transit is a matter of no little importance to the business man, and it is a conceded fact, that he can at all times, and under almost any state of the weather, reach a given point by the cars many minutes ahead of the stages.

The much talked of obstructions to business pursuits, in our wider thoroughfares, by having a double track, I consider more a matter of *fancy than fact.* In no way can railroads present as formidable impediments to travel through our streets, as have the deep snows of the present winter, and we have had the constant proof, that even the *narrowest of*

*our streets* have been in a better condition for all kinds of travel, than the wider*, and most frequented ones.

Respectfully yours,

JAMES S. LIBBY.

*New York, February* 25, 1856.

DEAR SIR:

You inquire of us, whether, as owners of real estate upon the city railroad routes down town, we are of opinion that such railways have the effect of depreciating the value of real estate?

To which, we have no hesitation in replying, generally, in the negative.

FREDERIC DE PEYSTER,
WILSON G. HUNT & CO.,
CHARLES ST. JOHN, 49 Barclay,
JAMES S. LIBBY.

---

* Upon which are laid the railroads.

X.

# PASSENGER RAILWAYS

# GREAT THOROUGHFARES.

---

## From the London Times.

"The question is whether the traffic of this metropolis is to remain in such a state as to absorb more time in getting from the Bank to the Treasury or the Houses of Parliament than would be required to reach London from Reigate or Windsor? It is proposed to lay a railway from Notting-hill-gate to the Bank, and relieve Cheapside, Holborn, Fleet-street, &c, of the 1,592 *omnibus* loads of passengers to that district by which these thoroughfares are daily impeded. The tramway would consist simply of a small grooved rail let into the road, and would not create the slightest interference with the ordinary traffic, the system being similar to that which has for years been used successfully in the principal American cities. It is asserted that it would enable three times the number of passengers to be carried by the existing number of horses, thus affording an opportunity for a commodious construction of vehicles simultaneously with a vast reduction in fares; that it would reduce parochial rates by preventing wear and tear of the roads, and that, in a great measure, it will remove noise. It is certain the present system of London locomotion cannot continue much longer. Each suggestion for a remedy is discountenanced. Underground lines, tubular lines, and every other contrivance that would promise a mitigation of the evil, have one after the

other been set aside, but the feeling, that something must soon be done, daily increases. If any one would take the trouble to calculate the annual money loss to our population from this monstrous anomaly, which causes their persons and goods to be blocked up daily in the midst of their most hurried avocations, while every faculty is taxed to accelerate their communications with America, Australia, or the continent, it would be found that the sum we pay for the whole of our ocean mail service would not compare with it. Suppose a contrivance that might save but half an hour a-day even to only 100,000 of our population, and valuing their time but at six-pence per hour, the economy per annum would be little short of 500,000*l.*, and this without reckoning any advantage in the transmission of merchandise and the non-delay of horses. It is palpable, therefore, that millions are annually sacrificed through the want of some Parliamentry and municipal recognition of the necessity of encouraging any feasible scheme that may lessen such gigantic national waste. Objections can, of course, be raised to everything in turn, but the mischief has now reached a point at which it is the business of those who pursue this course to state the plans they are prepared to offer in substitution."

## New York.

A railway in Broadway, the great thoroughfare of New York, was ably advocated during the past winter by the New York Courier and Enquirer, and other papers of the same high standing published in that city. A Bill, authorizing the construction of such a railway, passed the Assembly of the New York Legislature, at its last session, and failed in the Senate by two or three votes. So urgent and apparent was the need of this improvement, that the immense capital invested in omnibuses, and the parallel railways, estimated at five million dollars, with paid agents present the whole winter at Albany, could scarcely contend against the step of Progress. The success of the Broadway Railway Bill next winter may be anticipated with the greatest confidence.

## XI.

# POWERFUL OPPOSITION TO AN INNOVATION NO TEST OF ITS CHARACTER.

---

### Introduction of Turnpikes.

Macaulay, in his "History of England," vol. 1, chapter 3, says:

"Soon after the Restoration, an Act, the first of our many turnpike Acts, was passed. This innovation, however, excited many murmurs; and the other great avenues to the capital were long left under the old system. A change was at length effected, but not without great difficulty. It was not till many toll-bars had been violently pulled down, till the *troops had in many districts been forced to act against the people, and till much blood had been shed*, that a good system was introduced. By slow degrees reason triumphed over prejudice; and our island is now crossed in every direction by near thirty thousand miles of turnpike road."

Some very interesting details of the war upon Turnpikes, may be found in "The Gentleman's Magazine and Historical Chronicle, Vol. XIX. for the year 1749, London." Pages, 376, 377, &c. (Franklin Library. No. 544, 8vo.)

# Introduction of Railroads.

The prejudices of all classes, high and low, against railroads, at their first introduction, and the hardships endured by their promoters, may be found in a recent publication, entitled, "The Life of George Stephenson, Railway Engineer. By Samuel Smiles. Boston: Ticknor & Fields: 1858." The following are a few extracts from that book:

"The people in the neighborhood of Easton Hill, observing the extraordinary proceedings going on with chains and theodolite, rose against the surveyors, and compelled them to desist. Mr. Padley's assistant was apprehended, forcibly dragged off the ground, and was only liberated on giving his solemn promise never to return there on a similar business. Finding it impossible to proceed with any survey in the neighborhood of Liverpool, in consequence of this opposition on the part of the inhabitants, Mr. Sandars suggested that the party should proceed to Prescot, and make a trial survey there. They proceeded accordingly with the survey near Prescot, meeting with great opposition from the landowners and farmers along the proposed line of road, who drove them off their grounds, and subjected them to all manner of insults."—P. 168.

"Justice Bourne ordered his men to be constantly on the watch, to turn back the surveyors wherever met with in the fields. The farmers and laborers were only too ready to follow up his instructions. Men were stationed at the field gates with pitchforks, and sometimes with guns, to drive them back. At St. Helen's, one of the chainmen was laid hold of by a mob of colliers, and threatened to be hurled down a coalpit. A number of men, women, and children collected and ran after the surveyors wherever they made their appearance, bawling nicknames and throwing stones at them. As one of the chainmen was climbing over a gate one day, a laborer

made at him with a pitchfork, and ran it through his clothes into his back; other watchers running up, the chainman, who was more stunned than hurt, took to his heels and fled. But the theodolite most excited the fury of the natives, who concentrated on the man who carried it their fiercest execrations and their most offensive nicknames.

A powerful fellow, a noted bruiser, was hired by the surveyors to carry the instrument, with a view to its protection against all assailants; but one day an equally powerful fellow, a St. Helen's collier, who was the cock of the walk in his neighborhood, made up to the theodolite carrier to wrest it from him by sheer force. A battle took place, the collier was soundly pummelled, the natives poured in volleys of stones upon the surveyors and their instruments, and the theodolite was smashed to pieces."—P. 169.

"The survey was proceeded with, in the face of great opposition on the part of the proprietors of the lands through which the railway was intended to pass. The prejudices of the farming and laboring classes were strongly excited against the persons employed upon the ground, and it was with the greatest difficulty that the levels could be taken. This opposition was especially manifested when the attempt was made to survey the line through the property of Lord Derby and that of Lord Sefton, and also where it crossed the Duke of Bridgewater's canal. At Knowsley, Mr. Stephenson was driven off the ground by the keepers, and threatened with rough handling if found there again. Lord Derby's farmers also turned out their men to watch the surveying party, and prevent them entering upon any lands where they had the power of driving them off. Afterwards, Mr. Stephenson suddenly and unexpectedly went upon the ground with a body of surveyors and their assistants who outnumbered Lord Derby's keepers and farmers, hastily collected to resist them; and this time they were only threatened with the legal consequences of their trespass. The engineer's excuse for taking so many people with him was, that he 'did not like the instruments to be broken, as they had cost a great deal of money;' and his reason for making the survey in spite of Lord Derby's refusal to permit him to enter on his lands was, that he 'had received the orders of the committee to make the survey.'* The same sort of resistance was offered by Lord Sefton's keepers and

* Evidence before the Committee of the House of Commons on the Liverpool and Manchester Railroad Bill. Session 1825, pp. 272, 273.

farm laborers, so that only a very imperfect survey could be made of the line where it passed through those two noblemen's domains."—P. 201.

"Mr. Stephenson, afterwards describing the difficulties which he had thus encountered, said:—'I was threatened to be ducked in the pond if I proceeded, and, of course, we had a great deal of the survey to take by stealth, at the time when the people were at dinner. We could not get it done by night: indeed, we were watched day and night, and guns were discharged over the grounds belonging to Captain Bradshaw to prevent us. I can state further, that I was myself twice turned off Mr. Bradshaw's grounds by his men; and they said if I did not go instantly, they would take me up and carry me off to Worsley.*"—P. 202.

"In the House of Commons, Sir Isaac Coffin denounced the project as a most flagrant imposition. He could not consent to see widows' premises invaded; and 'how,' he asked, in the most dignified, senatorial manner, "how would any person like to have a railroad under his parlor window? . . . . What, he would like to know, was to be done with all those who had advanced money in making and repairing turnpike roads? What with those who may still wish to travel in their own or hired carriages, after the fashion of their forefathers? What was to become of coach-makers, harness-makers, coach-masters, and coachmen, inn-keepers, horse-breeders, and horse-dealers? Was the House aware of the smoke and noise, the hiss and whirl, which locomotive engines, passing at the rate of ten or twelve miles an hour, would occasion? Neither the cattle ploughing in the fields or grazing in the meadows could behold them without dismay. . . . Iron would be raised in price one hundred per cent., or more probably exhaused altogether! It would be the greatest nuisance, the most complete disturbance of quiet and comfort in all parts of the kingdom, that the ingenuity of man could invent!'"—Pp. 229, 230.

"Lords Derby and Sefton, who, by their opposition, forced the line from their estates, and compelled Mr. Stephenson to take it over the worst part of Chat Moss, were afterwards found patronizing a second and rival line between Liverpool and Manchester, on condition that the line should pass through their property."—P. 279.

* Proceedings of the Committee on the Liverpool and Manchester Railroad Bill. Evidence, p. 261.

"The line from London to Birmingham would naturally have passed close to the handsome town of Northampton, and was so projected. But the inhabitants, urged on by the local press, and *excited by men of influence and education*, opposed the project, and succeeded in forcing the promoters, in their resurvey of the line, to pass the town at a distance. The necessity was thus involved of distorting the line, which incurred the enormous expense of constructing the Kilsby Tunnel. Not many years elapsed before the very same inhabitants of Northampton became clamorous for railway accommodation, and a special branch was constructed for them. The additional cost involved by this forced deviation of the line could not have amounted to less than half a million sterling."—P. 292.

"A clergyman made such alarming demonstrations of his opposition, that the extraordinary expedient was resorted to of surveying his property during the time he was engaged in the pulpit. This was accomplished by having a strong force of surveyors in readiness to commence their operations, and entering the clergyman's grounds on the one side at the same moment that they saw him fairly off them on the other; by a well-organized and systematic arrangement, each man concluded his allotted task just as the reverend gentleman concluded his sermon; so that, before he left the church, the deed was done, and the sinners had all decamped."—P. 295.

"It was proposed to carry a line through Kent, by the populous town of Maidstone. But a public meeting was held to oppose the project; and the railway had not a single supporter among the townspeople. The railway, when at length formed through Kent, passed Maidstone at a distance; but in a few years the Maidstone burgesses, like those of Northampton, became clamorous for a railway; and a branch was formed for their accommodation."—P. 305.

"Colonel Sibthorpe even went so far as to declare that he 'would rather meet a highwayman, or see a burglar on his premises, than an engineer; he should be much more safe, and of the two classes he thought the former more respectable!'" —P. 306.

"A noble Marquis compelled the company to pass his mansion at a distance of at least five miles, to do which it was necessary to construct two expensive tunnels. When the line was opened, his lordship felt the exceeding inconvenience of being so far distant from a railway station, and requested the company to provide a branch for his accommodation. As he had already put them to enormous and unnecessary ex-

pense, they respectfully declined doing so, and he has since been under the necessity of himself constructing a branch at a cost of one hundred and sixty thousand pounds, which he has requested the parent company to do him the favor of working for him."—P. 313.

Et passim.

The Quarterly Review, for March, 1825, says:

"We are not the advocates for visionary projects that interfere with useful establishments; we scout the idea of a general railroad as altogether impracticable. . . . The gross exaggerations of the powers of the locomotive engine, or, to speak in plain English, the *steam-carriage*, may delude for a time, but must end in the mortification of those concerned. What can be more palpably absurd and ridiculous than the prospect held out of locomotives travelling *twice as fast* as stage-coaches! We should as soon expect the people of Woolwich to suffer themselves to be fired off upon one of Congreve's ricochet rockets, as to trust themselves to the mercy of such a machine going at such a rate. We will back old Father Thames against the Woolwich Railway for any sum."

## Introduction of Gas.

The fanciful nature of the objections, which were started by some of our *best citizens*, against the introduction of gas, is set forth in the "Report of the Committee to whom was referred sundry memorials against lighting the city with Gas. Philadelphia: L. R. Bailey, 1833." (Franklin Library. No. 9129, 8vo.)

XII.

# PETITIONS FOR A RAILWAY ON CHESTNUT AND WALNUT STREETS.

---

*To the Select and Common Councils of the City of Philadelphia.*

Having learned that a Memorial was presented to your honorable Bodies some time since asking the privilege of constructing a City Passenger Railway, (running east and west on Chestnut and Walnut Streets), we the undersigned respectfully request that the said privilege may be speedily granted, in order that said Railway may be constructed as expeditiously as possible.

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| F. V. Krug & Co., | No. 325 | Chestnut | street. |
| L. A. Godey, | 323 | " | " |
| Ellis S. Archer, | 329 | " | " |
| Wm. H. Miskey, | 329 | " | " |
| J. J. Fullerton, | 331 | " | " |
| John T. Wilson, | 331 | " | " |
| Samuel Miller, | 331 | " | " |

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Jas. Campbell, | 339 | Chestnut | street. |
| T. F. Fouladoux, | 415 | " | " |
| Joseph Hufty, | 407 | " | " |
| Robert De Cou, | 409 | " | " |
| John Wandell, Jr., | 409 | " | " |
| Sam'l Robinson, | 409 | " | " |
| Charles E. Thompson, | 413 | " | " |
| Morton & Rood, | 413 | " | " |
| C. Croll, | 415 | " | " |
| J. G. L. Brown, | 417 | " | " |
| Jas. J. Keepe, | 417 | " | " |
| John L. Linton, | 425 | " | " |
| Frs. Blackburne, | 433 | " | " |
| O. E. Birkhead, | 1524 | " | " |
| W. H. Maurice, | 335 | " | " |
| Joy, Coe & Co., | 439 | " | " |
| G. G. Evans, | | | |
| William Willard, | 439 | " | " |
| Alex. Wray & Co., | | | |
| John Weik, | 533 | " | " |
| Daniel Echternach, | 511 | " | " |
| F. De B. Richards, | 515 | " | " |
| John Tracy, | 517 | " | " |
| Sam'l H. Mattson, | 911 | " | " |
| John Wilson, | 909 | " | " |
| Thomas Griffith, | 905 | " | " |
| Wm. H. Z. Kearney, | 900 | " | " |
| C. J. Haverstick, | 313 | " | " |
| N. E. Lawrence, | 311 | " | " |
| Thos. E. Quin, | 311 | " | " |
| Wm. H. Gardner, | 311 | " | " |
| Charles Manley, | 301 | " | " |
| Geo. E. Painter, | 303 | " | " |
| G. Leppien, | 327 | " | " |
| Carl Otto Peters, | 227 | " | " |
| Robert E. Hornor, | 227 | " | " |
| James Guyer & Co., | 229 | " | " |
| James Elliott, | | | |
| L. McClury, | | | |
| Wm. Hawthorne, | | | |
| Chas. Laing & Co., | 537 | " | " |
| S. H. Crittenden, | 637 | " | " |
| Jno. Wilson, | | | |
| J. Helmich, | 533 | " | " |

Hugo Liebing, 533 Chesnut street.
Julius Taylor, 537 " "
B. F. Kelley, 601 " "
John Doherty, 601 " "
D. W. Hutchin, 603 " "
S. H. Cooper, 603 & 605 " "
Wm. Ryan & Co., 603 & 605 " "
Wm. T. Carpenter, 607 " "
G. A. Haines, 607 " "
T. B. Pugh, 615 " "
A. Werner, 619 " "
J. D. Brown, 621 " "
John McFarlan, 621 " "
J. A. Eshleman, 631 " "
Richard Dollard, 513 " "
Thompson Black, N. W. cor. Broad and Chestnut streets.
C. T. Amsler, 635 Chestnut street.
Joseph Epley, " "
Peter Walker, " "
W. E. Schenck, 821 " "
R'd Scofield, 837 " "
J. T. Flaherty, 837 " "
James J. Griffiths, 915 " "
George W. Moore, 927 " "
John Sweency, 1029 " "
Geo. D. Glenn, 600 " "
C. M. Berry, Fifth and Chestnut street.
John Miller, Tenth and Chestnut streets.
J. A. B. Shaw, 1023 Chestnut street, Faney Goods.
Wm. R. Brown, 921 " "
C. Moore, 1039 " "
George F. Randolph, 1229 " "
C. P. Foster, 1233 " "
Wm. H. Perpignan, 927 " "
Stephen T. Beale,
Henry S. Crabbe, 1837 " "
A. R. McHenry, 1937 " "
W. Gray Stillé, 1033 " "
A. Owen Stillé, " " "
Herbert A. Halfman, 1315 " "
H. G. Oliver, 1351 " "
Lewis Buddy, 1409 Chestnut street.
C. A. Nossiter, 1413 "

Richard M. Moore, 1415 Chestnut street.
Ann W. Mather, " "
A. B. Campbell, M. D., 1419 "
A. R. Thomas, M. D., 1429 "
F. Howard Eldridge, 1433 "
G. Morgan Eldridge, " "
Thomas Riley, 1437 "
Isaac R. Beam, 2043 "
James Thompson, 2101 "
John A. Morrison, 1701 "
M. V. Fagan, 1621 "
Geo. F. Yhost, " "
A. Robins, " "
Henry S. Borie, " "
J. H. Brolasky, 1417 "
Robert Parvin, 1200 Chestnut Street.
Joseph Englebert, 1619 Chestnut street.
Wm. H. Sickels, Eighth and Chestnut streets.
R. N. Thompson, 1431 Chestnut street.
Fr. Hassold, 1543 " "
Henry Ensign, Jr., 1703 " "
Samuel W. Paul, 1821 " "
T. P. Morris, 1827 " "
Charles Neff, 1901 " "
Samuel Jarden, 1907 " "
M. Thackray & Co., 1336 " "
Jas. T. Wilson, 1300 " "
Sam'l J. Johnson, 1300 " "
A. B. Reichenbach, 1230 " "
Geo. W. Meezer, 1226 " "
J. Cheyney, 1122 Chestnut street, Am. S. S. Union.
R. B. Westbrook, 1122 " " " " "
Hunt, Webster & Co., 820 " " Sewing Machines.
Herman Dercum, 820 " "
John R. Vogdes, 1224 Chestnut & n. e. cor. 20th & Chestnut sts.
John R. Vogdes, Trustee of the Estate of James Swain, s. e. cor. 7th & Chestnut street.
F. Brown, 5th & Chestnut streets.
G. P. Mitchell, 523 Chestnut street.
J. Johnson, 1319 " "
Edward Johnson, J. J., Trustee.
W. Wernwag, 1717 Chestnut street.
Dr. G. Schwartz, " "
A. F. Cheesbrough, 1510 " "

Thos. C. Heyl,
Samuel Henry,
Isaac Elliott, 35 feet fronting on Chestnut, between 2d & 3d.
Samuel W. Paul, 20 feet on Chestnut street.
William Wernwag, 74 feet on Chestnut street.
Charles B. Cooper, 20 feet on Chestnut street.
Isaac R. Beam, 31 feet, Chestnut street east of 21st.
Oliver Fales, 80 feet.
John W. Simes, Jr., 37 feet on Chestnut street.
Thomas A. Robinson,
W. L. Schaffer, trustee, 267 feet on Chestnut street.
William F. Simes, Chestnut near 22d, 23 feet.
William H. Crabbe, 1837 Chestnut and 433½ Walnut streets.
C. Leland, 83 Chestnut street, 25 feet.
William J. Duane, Walnut street, 31 feet.
I. Hazlehurst, 26 feet.

Jno. C. Sims, Secretary for American Life Insurance & Trust Company, s. e. corner 4th and Walnut streets, 26½ feet.

H. K. Richardson, Sec. for Great Western Insurance and Trust Company, n. w. corner 4th and Walnut, 80 feet.

Samuel Simes, n. w. corner 12th and Chestnut, 60 feet.

Jane Johnson, 60 feet.
Charles Williams, 70 feet.

William V. Pettit, 58 feet east of the Schuylkill on Chestnut street, and twenty-three feet on Walnut street.

John W. Simes, 18 feet 8 in. on Chestnut, west of 20th street.

D. H. Rockhill, 603 and 605.

Thomas McEwen, 1110 Walnut street, 20 feet.
Merritt & Turnbull, cor. Front and Chestnut sts.
Wm. C. Aiken, 1 Chestnut st.
Wm. H. McGlensey, Water & Chestnut sts.
D. Boyten Aitkins, " "
J. K. Elwell, " "
Rawlings & Zeising, 203 Chestnut st.
J. & P. Brickhead, 1524 Chestnut street.
James Cantwell, 2000 " "
Jno. Fallon, 26½ feet.
E. Neal, M. D., 923 Chestnut street.
Farr & Thompson, 324 " "
Wm. Shubert, 2117 " "
A. Schmitz, 2010 " "

C. E. Stauring, corner of Eighth and Chestnut street.
John McIntyre, 611 Walnut street.
Edward C. Quin, 611 " "
Duane Williams, 433½ " "
J. M. Holcomb, 429 " "
J. Gumpel, 423 " "
W. S. Wolf, 820 " "
Wm. F. Johnston, 419 " "
N. B. Boyd, 419 " "
Sam. Merrick, 419 " "
J. D. Reinboth, 436 " "
Lawrence Lewis, 436 " "
R. M. Lewis, Jr., 436 " "
Joseph R. Paxton, 417 " "
John A. Burton, 504 " "
J. Norris, Eighteenth near Walnut.
Samuel Rhodes,
Henry G. Freeman, Jr.,
Morgan Ash,
Jacob Snider, Senr.,
J. R. Patten, 314½ Walnut street.
W. H. Winter, " "
Henry A. Dreer, 327 Chestnut street.
Geo. W. Farr, Jr., 324 " "
William M. Farr, 324 " "
A. M. Hull, 324 " "
Ch. M. Schott, 309 Walnut street.
J. S. Shaner, 34½ " "
Wm. S. Elbert, 321 " "
J. H. Randall, 411 Chestnut street.
B. Scott, 431 " "
John M. Gummey, 520 Walnut street.
Wm. R. Guier,
J. A. Welsh, 204 South 3d below Walnut street.
J. R. Burden,
J. Austin Parrish, 400 Walnut street.
D. M. Mitcheson, 530 " "
Alfred D. Brick, 430 " "
Percy Heilner, 4th and Walnut streets.
G. W. Stead, 733 Chestnut street.
E. A. Palmer, 1508 Chestnut st.
J. H. Brolasky, 1417 Chestnut st.
Charles Blackiston, 2043 Chestnut st.
S. Henry Norris, 1804 Chestnut st.

William Geo. Norris, 111 Chestnut st.
M. A. Wurts, 1404 Chestnut st.
J. B. Porter, Jr., 923 Chestnut street.
R. D. Scofield, 837 Chestnut.
J. T. Flaherty,
J. S. Cummings, St. Lawrence Hotel.
C. Roth, 8th & Chestnut.
G. W. Whitson,
Jonathan Hugill, Chestnut.
G. W. Waite, 1211 Chestnut.
Robt. N. Waite, 1211 "
H. Plum,
Chas. Whitson,
Robt. Buchanan,
Edward P. Kelly, Chestnut.
W. Watson,
N. E. Nutz,
Wm. S. Levering,
B. Jacob,
Jas. F. Bell,
G. W. Day,
C. Wiestenberg,
R. Pearsall,
Wm. Norris,
Wm. A. Christman,
James Howard,
R. Donagan,
James Lynch, 2300, Chestnut street.
Thomas A. Andrews, Concert Hall, Chestnut street.
R. L. Madison, M. D., 1516 Chestnut street.
T. E. Luckett, M. D., " " "
Denney & Lacey, N. E. cor. 17th and Chestnut streets.
Preston W. Russell, 1702, Chestnut street.
J. M. Hughes, 1635, " "
A. W. Gayley, 1800, " "
M. E. Griffith, 1802, Chestnut street.
Samuel A. C. Kochersperger, 1713 Chestnut street,
David Horner, 10th and Chestnut streets.
Jeremiah McGinley, 10th and Walnut streets.
Stratton & Brother, 719 Walnut street.

S. R. Crawford, President U. S. Life Insurance Co.
Wm. R. Bonsall, M. D., 250 Chestnut street.
A. S. Randall, 248 " "
Thomas S. Bender, Chestnut below 3d street.
Charles P. Dieterich, 308 Chestnut street.
R. P. M'Cullagh, 320 " "
C. P. Lamberson, " " "
H. L. Leaf, Adams' Express Co.
J. C. Oehlschlager,
Wm. W. Dorsey, 331, Walnut street.
Alex. C. Hart, M. D., 250 Chestnut street.
Joseph P. Quinn, 248 " "
Pemberton Janney, 248 " "
F. Lovejoy, 248 " "
John Smylie, Jr., 248 " "
Orr Bothwell, 248 " "
W. C. Meyers, 92 " "
J. P. Kister, 6th and Chestnut streets.
Samuel M Hoppar, 226 Chestnut street.
G. W. Stead, 733 " "
F. A. Hoyt & Brother, (if the Omnibuses are taken off, 10th and Chestnut streets.)
C. S. Williamson, " " " " " "
Alex. Bond, " " " " " "
Daniel Ferris, 1037, Chestnut street.
Murphey & Yarnall, 922, Chestnut street, if the Omnibuses are removed.
James C. Finn,
Albert R. Schofield,
Thomas Hawksworth, (remove the Omnibuses.)
Chas. J. Field,
A. F. Nicholas, Walnut and 2d streets.
James Newell, 302 Walnut street.
Geo. W. Jones,
H. I. Stout,
E. E. Smith, 216 Walnut street.
Jos. Rudolph,
Robert McCauley,
E. S. Brook,
C. Gaskill, 218 Walnut street.
Geo. W. Kuyter, 213 " "
W. H. Gordon, 213 " "
J. F. Byrnes,
John W. Tilford, 218 Walnut street.
A. Van Arsdale, 218 " "
C. Roberts, " " above Third.
Edward L. Walker, 606, Chestnut street.

James S. Barber, South East Corner Second and Chestnut streets.
Wm. C. Baxter, 325 Walnut st.
Alfred Biles, N. W. cor. Fourth & Walnut street.
A. V. Zane, 422 " "
Joshua Spering,
G. C. Bacmeister, 432 " "
Geo. W. Ford,
J. Patriek,
J. M. Biekel,
Geo. F. Willis, N. E. cor. of Third & Chestnut street.
J. T. Hickman, } 219 Walnut street.
John Middleton, }
Charles Keyser,
Charles W. Milner,
W. C. Zane, 219 Walnut street.
J. Eldon Salter,
Aaron Edmonds,
Henry L. Lippincott, Franklin House.
Gustavus A. Wiedner, 217 Walnut street.
William Harper, Jr., " "
William Brian,
Charles Richardson, 237 Chestnut street.
H. Holthausen, 227 " "
John Pondir, 227 " "
Richard Henry, 223 " "
Richard P. White, 223 " "
George A. Hinckin, 1600 " "
C. M. Thorp, 202 " "
Charles English, 105 Chestnut street.
R. R. Claiborne, Third and Chestnut streets.
J. E. Todd, " " "
L. Cruikshank, " " "
Wm. S. Canning, " " "
Jno. R. Henderson, " " "
Andrew Kettle, " " "
C. B. Church, " " "
J. W. Oehlschlager, Twelfth and Walnut streets.
Franeis R. Russle, 1421 Chestnut street.
William Orr, Third and Chestnut streets.
James Durham, " " "
B. McCleg, " " "
N. J. Cain, " " "
Geo. W. Moore, 927 " "
John Sweeney, 1029 " "
L. A. Alfred Schmidt, 1026 " "
George Howell, Jr., 1022 " "
W. B. Zieber.
Hughes & Müller, 841 Chestnut street.

J. H. Schomacker, & Co., 1021 Chestnut street
Albert Spence, 1022 " "
Charles H. Savournin, Third below Chestnut street.
G. G. Claiborn, Third and Chestnut streets.
Edmund Jno. Furlong,
John F. Daly, 728 Chestnut street.
James Moore,
S. C. B. Rahn,
C. B. Pottenger,
Wm. Caldwell, Chestnut street.
Lane Schofield,
Edward N. Murray,
Wm. Ralinteory, 131 Walnut street.
Farrel, Herring & Co., 130 "
Harvey Gillam,
Geo. M. Worl, 120 "
M. Frieshman, 114 "
J. S. Baum, 113 "
J. L. Taylor, 1228 "
A. J. McKaraher,
S. E. Cohen,
W. P. Cropper,
A. W. M'Clasky,
George T. Parry,
James R. Hunter, S. E. cor. Third and Chestnut streets.
E. W. Heist, 302 Chestnut street.
Thos. P. Bladen, " "
Pliny Fisk, 250 "
J. W. Harrison, 248 "
J. W. Gorl, Franklin House. "
Albert B. Doel, " "
Charles Armstrong,
Thomas S. Quigly,
W. Denby,
Samuel P. Cornwell, National Theatre.
Alexander Wilson, Ninth and Walnut streets.
John R. Rice,
W. H. Stephens,
George Koockogey,
M. Slevin,
James H. Hutchinson, 830 Walnut street.
J. W. Beck,
W. W. Longstreth,
Peter M. Buehler,
P. Beech, 200 Walnut street.

J. Fisher Leaming*
Green, Brother & Cooper
Alexander Johnston
J. S. O'Neill, M. D.
Jaeob Earnest
Benjamin Emerick
W. Sargent
C. M. Eakin
J. S. Rose, M. D.
James Allen
R. Morris Smith
Joseph Johnson
Isaae W. Hughes, M. D.
T. J. Hughes
Samuel R. Lentz
W. B. Wolfe
Charles H. Newell
E. S. Burnett
C. Price Rose
J. G. Butler
W. W. Perrine
Jas. J. Boswell
John H. Eaton
Robt. M. Lindsay
B. Richardson
John Bak
Fr. Viereik
Jno. Tobin
Dan'l Haines
John Budd
Peter Gasperi
Wilhelm Rohde
John Walter
E. Y. Smith
Harmanus Neff
C. F. Huch
J. M. Armstrong
Geo. W. Howard
G. F. Steward
D. M. Moorhead
L. P. Armstrong

H. S. Gardiner
W. W. Hughes
Dana Eames
H. Heins
Rob. P. Kern
H. S. Benner
B. R. Miller
Edward Freeman
Penrose Fell
Lewis W. Ralston
S. T. Jones
J. R. McCorkle
Geo. M. Freeman
A. Slemmer
P. Redfield
L. Chamberlain
John S. Wilson
C. G. Robeson
David M. Hofars
Henry T. Rees
A. H. Manderson
E. K. Shelmerdine
John S. Davis
Joseph Zentmayer
David Van Beil
Joseph E. Jackson
Geo. Wm. Witham
Richard Smith
Tho. McKellar
P A Jordan
Geo. W. Logan
E. T. Campbell
John Lodor
Chas. H. Beeler, Jr.
Wm. Connely
Thos. A. Baker
James King
Louis Firarrotto
Wm. J. Ramage
S. W. Yates
John Maclean

---

* Of those who have signed, without adding their numbers, many reside upon Chestnut or Walnut streets.

J. L. Smith
Geo. C. Work
Wm. Goodhart
B. Singleton
Cadw. Griffith
Thomas A. Rockwell
Jacob Headman
Henry D. Headman
Chas. King
David Eberle
Daniel B. Emerick
Joseph H. Boswell
Benj. G. S. Wilks
Ephraim W. South
S. Conrad
J. Buckingham
Jno. R. Bishop
Granello & Taylor
Thos. S. McGrath
Thomas Y. Midlen
Reed & Co.
D. B. Cassent
E. M. Haines
Thos. C. Lippincott
Edward Penington, Jr.
Geo. S. Bethell
J. Smith Harris
James B. Baggs
John Kuhn
Jacob Rallee
A. H. Germer
H. Harrison
M. A. Davis
Ed. Pauling
Joseph Frees
Robert Morris
Joh. M. Helmbold
P. McBryan
James Mullin
John Taylor
Jeremiah McGinley
John Latour
William Wyant
Charles G. Burnett
L. C. Gropengiesser

Geo. Junkin, Jr.
John E. Schneider
Francis M. Lorrillieu
James L. Boyd
E. L. Garren
Geo. S. Douglass
W. W. Hughes
Henry Beck
James M. Beck
G. Reinhard
Anthony Beck
Wm. J. Thomas
Wm. Coyle
George Smith
M. Twiss
E. O. Thompson
Wm. H. Elsegood
Robt. Farrell
A. Wescott
C. L. Crump
M. S. Farrell
Alx. H. Brown
David Smith
E. C. Allen
Wm. Keim
H. H. Scott
Geo. M. Dillen
R. W. Barnard
Wm. H. Patton
Chas. N. Snider
Geo. W. Hurst
A. McLean
H. J. Hampton
W. W. Kunkel
W. A. Covington
Wm. B. Wooldridge
Wm. C. Barnard
M. Fleu
Chas. H. Burns
Edwin Hurley
Henry M. Dechert
J. Davis Boswell
James J. Boswell, per J. D. B.
S. C. Huston
L. R. Massey

Jos. Allison
H. C. Hanson
H. C. Townsend
Charles B. Hare
Wm. P. McLane
Robert D. Pennell
Charles Tage
W. D. Baker
H. R. Kneass
Joshua T. Owen
T. M. Quicksall
J. B. Colahan
Wm. Stokes
Morton M. Buckley
P. McCormick
M. B. Dyott
W. R. Tihton
A. J. Weidener
F. Curtis
Geo. Swartz, Jr.
Wm. Hall
James McGettigan
John J. Duddy
Isaac E. Stranahan
John H. Brimner
Julius Herriet
John Robb
Felix Lauer
Robert Christy
Randolph Adams
Michael J. Cochran
Wm. McDowell
Alexander Robb
Chas. F. Warwick
John Shill & Sons
James Milton
E. Bourne
Hunt & Isaacs
J. E. Horschel
James McGonigle
Charles Howard
Henry Goette
Richard Norris

Sansom Perot
Philip Miller
John Mason
Wm. W. Mason
Joseph Edwards
James Walker
Charles Quinn
James Irvine
Francis Fox
G. T. Brown
J. R. Blakiston
F. T. Webster
John Young
John A. Brown
W. L. Laws
A. G. Sickel
Charles E. Roberts
H. F. McReynolds
F. P. Dubosq
J. A. Gartis
Benjamin Franklin
T. W. Williams
J. K. Wright
J. W. Geiger
R. Mitchell
R. F. Brown
Geo. Billger
Charles Barker
H. E. Clark
F. O. Deschamps
B. Hart
James Hollahan
E. Ferrett
James M. Moore
Alexander F. Huston
E. S. Hamett
J. M. Struthers
Calvin H. Test
Edward A. Warner
M. Murphy
E. Rogers
Henry F. Smith
Chauncey Bulkley

Geo. W. Lehman, Jr.
Wm. M. Christy
Jos. S. Kite
C. Bolin
Augustus Engibrour
Dr. W. H Litterman
John S. Hoffman
Thomas S. Taylor
John Jos. Sommers
Wm. Easler
A. McBride
Wm. F. McBride
John Digmon
Joseph Mort
Chas. D. Lybrand
W. M. Gallagher
S. C. Gallagher
J. B. Buckwalter
Wm. C. Showaker
Samuel M. Hopper
Wm. M. Spangler
T. M. Reans
R. H. Johnson
A. H. Sharp
George Sharp
William Sharp
Jacob H. Lentz
Charles Hucke
M. D. Sybert
G. Schwarz
John Schenk
Geo. Carter
Jos. Siddons
Jos. E. Abbott
James Watson
W. R. Dutton
F. F. Brognard
C. A. Cornell
Wm. Kerr
Robert Houston
Sam. Allinson
L. A. Fousfitt
Geo. W. Flanagen
Thos. S. Crombarger

Petry Bro's
M. K. O'Donnell
W. T. Brantly
E. Bennett
F. F. Bernadou
J. C. Grayson
Rehn & Everett
C. L. Rehn
Lay & Brother
John R. Campbell
Henry Diehl
John P. Dettra
D. W. Mills
Geo. W. Wood
E. B. Shapleigh
Samuel T. Altemus
Wm. S. Rink
A. W. Woodward
Wm. M. Cooper
H. A. Jennings
J. H. Mullen
D. J. McCann
A. M. Pettit
Edwin A. Woodward
H. A. Brown
S. J. Solms
James. Miller
William T. Marks
Gilbert C. Rice
Joseph Mogridge
F. R. Colton
Thos. Pennall
Samuel Reid
W. Marshall
N. Chipman
W. H. Richards
John Fewsbury
Garret B. Culin
Chr. W. Bender
J. M. Buck
F. B. Hughes
J. C. Williams
E. Smith
R. Rothermel

S. Henry Norris
Caleb F. Clark
Jacob C. Freno
Thomas H. Connell
Chas. J. Walker
John Given
S. Johnson
O. T. Phorr
R. Jewell
A. Robertson
Wm. H. Stephens
Charles Moffitt
James Buchanan Hazlitt
John C. Daus
H. Hopper
John Dungan
Thomas McGarey
W. D. Jones
L. J. Schaefer
S. Y. Singleton
E. A. Manon
W. W. Fraley
John Wenn
Samuel M'Calley
John Easley
Wm. F. Parry
J. P. Warwick
John Randolph
Aug. J. Baton
B. F. Gallagher
Wm. D. Park
Hugh M'Cabe
Alfred Stimmel
George H. Dyball
John Robinson
Thomas D. Yees
Samuel M'Govern
Wm. Colbert
Isaac M. Bussinger
Thos Connor
Jno. D. Williams
O. B. Smith, Sr.
Francois Ravel, Jr.
John Alex. Allpt
J. H. DeBille
B. W. Trinkle
Wm. H. Parmenter

Geo. W. Harris
Martin Melcher
J. D. Bayne
John Fox
C. S. Jackson
Charles R. Jones
Shippen & Rugan
George B. Atkins
John H. De Buist
Martin Lauer
W. Gallagher
John S. Kane
John Grosart
Abm. Stickle
M. B. Young
W. J. McEntire
Jno. Marsh
G. W Taylor
A. Elken
Michael Butler
John Mayer
Theodore Mann
Joseph Mac Nichol
H. Horhetrass
A. B. Daviss
Thos. W. Gilbert
Henry Alexander
Gibbons Marsh
Th. C. Carpenter
Henry Young
John M. Plumley
S. R. Craig
H. A. Gildea
James Brieson
Henry A Kraft
Henry P. Warner
W. H. Fernon
John Choate
Thos. H. Tierney
T. M. Read
L. G. Wunder
J. M. Sherry
G. L. Carsons
H. Sewell, Jr.
Charles S. Austin
John McCaby
Robert West

Richard Paxson
G. T. Blakiston
L. Shuster Boraef
Henry Boraef
J. K. Howell
F. Buylaw
Joseph Monroe
W. W. Alexander
James M'Cully
C. Grubb
Lewis Cooper
R. H. Gratz
C. M. Taylor
Wm. Hopper
B. Blanchard
D. Kingport
Wm. Letford, Jr.
Jer. M. Brooks
Wm. B. Pickering
Robert E. Bayne
Benjamin Master
Thos. W. Summers
C. Swayne
J. Ruggles
Geo. F. Overly
T. C. Taylor
E. W. Ussher
E. G. Lindsey
Wm. W. Bell
Moro Phillips
Jonas Eberhart
Thomas Miller
Josiah Evans, Jr.
John Pickering
Henry G. Pickering
W. H. Radford
William Watson
Wm. B. Drew
Lewis V. Helmold
Alex. McConnell
John S. Boyd
R. H. Schannon
James W. Baneker
Wm. M. Evans

Saml. H. Rothermel
John M. Wetherell
S. B. Lent
John B. Duckworth
Henry Raymond
G. Davis Boswell
Jacob Lippincott
Wm. Shippen, M. D.
George W. Hufty
Thomas S. Begley
John K. Murphy
John Cotterell
Saml. B. Wood
George Crossman
James K. Drew
Edwin A. Hughes
Charles W. Edwards
Wm. C. Rice
George W. Bowman
Jacob Scheetz
Henry Wellbanks
William Brooks
J. B. Ripley
Henry M. Day
Wm. McCurnsey
Charles J. Davis
Joseph Keen
Samuel C. Downing
C. H. Melcher
John Titus
F. C. Kropff
Perry K. McNeille
Thomas Horan
Thomas L. Woolston
Nathaniel Gordon
E. Turley
John Gallagher
M. H. McEwen, M. D.
H. Atkinson
J. W. Moore
Geo. Prince
Isaac W. Potts
A. G. Wright
Adam Diller

Wm. M. Heyl & Co.
Thomas Daly Holmes
George Smith
C. C. Pierson
N. Pratt
John S. Clymer
C. Wharton Clifton
A. Drinkhouse
M. Anthony
William Brown
H. & L. Horter
J. Vineyard Murray
John B. Harbert
Joseph McCord
John V. Sloan
Peter G. Green
Robert Sithens
John Parker
Geo. H. Cloak
John S. Dull
John Dickinson
J. J. O'Donnell
Jos. N. Moreau
James F. Stevens
George D. Moreau
C. C. Stine
John J. Sullivan
John A. King
Alex. H. McCloy
Frs. H. Kamerer
John W. Hastings
F. J. Sharatt
Francis Renaut Jr.
Hiram M. Grosh
George H. Dyball
John F. Schell
R. A. Parrish
Geo. Cohill
Wm. Hodgson
E. R. Jones
John Lamb
Philip P. Cope
Henry Moore
A. L. Massey
Jos. Engard
John B. Squires
George Dunn
A. W. Suplee
Abraham Marshall
Patrick McGarry
Francis McManus
G. W. Jacoby
John Williams
James Harper
F. P. Donahoe
T. F. McCarthy
R. H. Gunnis
F. H. Green
H. Kirkpatrick
Jos. Torr
Thos. H. Clark
Chas. Cohill
Charles Kryder
Richard Cohill
D. J. King
T. Wallace Benton
John Thomas
Bobt. Dyball
James A. Taylor
Thomas J. Choate
C. F. Dickinson
Wm. Winfield
John Curry
Charles W. B. Acks
George W. Rogers
W. Shindel
John T. Evans
Wm. Leckie
James Denn
Walter J. Bell
Thomas D. Sealy
Wm. H. Edwards
Wm. H. Gordon
J. W. Wills
John D. Bayne
J. N. Hallowell

Chas. S. Davis
Charles Grill
W. F. Jones
Thos. G. Riley
Benjamin Sheneman
Chas. Seely
James M. Mulford
T. Dercum
Wm. F. Jonhston
Wm. C. Smith.
Daniel B. Emerick
H. M. Dorsheimer
J. Jacob Seufel
John Brynan
Milton F. Harrison
G. Chas. Michellach
Peter Conrad
Jno. Kuemmerle
M. Kuemmerle
R. S. Walton

Theo. M. Reger
James W. Palmer
Wm. Getty
John Kretshman
Chas. J. Griffith
Geo. Gardom
Israel Amies
C. Liebrich
T. Howard
J. Taunton
Daniel Cushman
Samuel S. Hess
Edward Dewees
Peter Dorn
Andrew Vetter
Chas. H. Charbonnier
Peter Uebroth
W. H. Pearce
F. Framhagen
Wm. G. Thompson

Wm. E. Tenbrook, 21 feet, 1952 Chestnut street.
William H. Helmbold, Second and Walnut streets.
Hy. Bourceau, Second street above Walnut.
Geo. Minster, " " "
Robert Morris, 130 S. Second st., between Walnut and Chesnut st.
John Richardson, " " " " "
Wm. A. Brown, 128 S. Second st. " " "
David H. Wright, 124 S. Second st. " " "
William S. Bell, " " " " " "
J. Fairgrieve, 122 " " " " "
Jacob R. Elfreth, " " " " " "
Newton L. Orrick, " " " " " "
Philip McCormick, 120 " " " " "
J. Anderson, 118 " " " " "
M. B. Dyott, 114 " " " " "
A. J. Weidener, 114 " " " " "
C. F. Warwick, 114 " " " " "
F. Curtis, 114 " " " " "
Geo. W. Grice, 112 " " " " "
Geo. Swartz, Jr., 110 " " " " "
C. Stevenson, 1108 Walnut street.
Jacob Alter,
Richard Tea, Chestnut, west of 20th street.
Wm. Kirk, 1502, Chestnut street 20 feet, and 70 feet on Walnut st.
Geo. B. Keen, Chestnut st., 50 feet.
Chas. Colladay, " 100 feet.

| | |
|---|---|
| Rob. Smith, | |
| Wm. L. Hirst, | 41 feet 6 inches, Blight House. |
| Charles S. Keyser, | |
| A. S. Letchworth, | |
| J. H. Markland, | |
| F. Tiernan, | |
| Aubrey H. Smith, | |
| Robert R. Levick, | 40 feet, Chestnut. |
| Peter L. Levick, | |
| L. P. Hedelt, | |
| Wright, Hunter & Co., | 26 ft. on Walnut st. |
| John Shill, | 104 South 2d. |
| E. G. Whitman & Co., | 102 South 2d. |
| J. Mitton, | 103 South 2d. |
| Jones Yerkes, | 105 South 2d. |
| John E. Horschel, | 113 South 2d st. |
| Edw. Richardson, | 70 ft. front, 117 South 2d st. |
| G. T. Stockdale, | 117 So. 2d st., Printer. |
| Louis D. Baug, | 129 So. 2d st. |
| Fisher & Co., | 141 South 2d st. |
| C. J. Tyndale, | 145 South 2d st. |
| S. Brooks, | 106 So. 2d st. |
| D. P. Peters, | 20 Chestnut. |
| J. Easler, | Dock & Walnut. |
| Wm. B. Wolfe, | Chestnut st., 100 feet, and 20 ft., No. 409. |
| George Sellers, | 250 feet. |
| R. Butler Price, | 400 feet Chestnut.<br>300 " Walnut. |
| John W. Dulles, | 50 feet on Chestnut st. |
| Whitton Evans, | 50 feet on Chestnut st. |
| B. T. Ashburner, | Chestnut st., 20 feet. |
| G. Phillips, | Chestnut st. |
| Philip Kelly, representing | 175 feet six inches, No. 1316 Chestnut st. |
| P. S. Duval, | No. 1007 Walnut, 18 ft. front. |

# INDEX.


PAGE.

GENERAL CONSIDERATION OF THE SUBJECT. ..... 3 to 11

PARTICULAR CONSIDERATION OF THE SUBJECT.

Concise Reasons in Favor..,..... 13 to 20

Objections—Answered Concisely ..... 21 to 32

APPENDIX.

I. Act to Incorporate the Central Passenger Railway Company..... 33 to 35

II. Ordinance to Regulate Passenger Railway Companies..... 36 to 38

III. Editorial Opinions Selected from the Public Press of Philadelphia.....

Public Ledger..... 39 to 40
Pennsylvanian..... 40 to 41
North American..... 41
Daily News..... 41 to 42
Even ng Bulletin..... 42 to 44
Evening Argus..... 45 to 48
Evening Journal..... 48 to 49
Public Ledger..... 49 to 51

IV. Communications Selected from the Public Press of Philadelphia.

The Omnibus vs. the City Railroad..... 52 to 55
The Right of Passing Over the Soil..... 55 to 57

V. Real Estate Fronting upon the Central Railway. 58

VI. Evidence Disproving that Passenger Railways Interfere with the Ordinary Business of the Street.

Fifth and Sixth street Residents..... 59
Professional Opinion..... 60 to 61

VII. Retrenchment of the Paving Expenses..... 62

VIII. Damage to Walls from Vibration Caused by Omnibuses ..... 63

IX. Evidence Disproving the Depreciation of Real Estate upon the Line of Passenger Railways. 64 to 67

X. Passenger Railways upon Great Thoroughfares.

London..... 68 to 69
New York..... 69

XI. Powerful Opposition to an Innovation no Test of its Character.

Introduction of Turnpikes..... 70
Introduction of Rail Roads..... 71 to 75
Introducti n of Gas..... 75

XII. Petitions for a Railway on Chestnut and Walnut Streets..... 76 to 94